


NUNC COGNOSCO EX PARTE



TRENT UNIVERSITY
LIBRARY



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2019 with funding from
Kahle/Austin Foundation

The Canadian Historical Association

Report of the Annual Meeting
Held at Victoria and Vancouver
June 16-19, 1948

With Historical Papers

Edited by R. A. PRESTON
Associate Editor, G. F. G. Stanley

TORONTO
THE UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO PRESS
1948

5000

C 26

1948

THE
CANADIAN HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION

1947-1948

Past Presidents

FRANK H. UNDERHILL

H. N. FIELDHOUSE

President

F. H. SOWARD

Vice-President

A. MAHEUX

English Secretary and Treasurer

NORMAN FEE, Ottawa

French Secretary

SERAPHIN MARION, Ottawa

Editor, Canadian Historical Association Report

R. A. PRESTON

Associate Editor

G. F. G. STANLEY

Council

A. G. BAILEY, Fredericton, N.B.
J.-C. BONENFANT, Quebec, P.Q.
R. W. COLLINS, Edmonton, Alta.
A. D'ESCHAMBAULT, St. Boniface, Man.
J.-C. FALARDEAU, Quebec, P.Q.
JAMES A. GIBSON, Ottawa, Ont.

D. G. KERR, Sackville, N.B.
D. C. MASTERS, Lennoxville, P.Q.
W. L. MORTON, Winnipeg, Man.
K. M. SETTON, Winnipeg, Man.
J. J. TALMAN, London, Ont.
J. W. WATSON, Hamilton, Ont.

CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
Then and Now : 1848 and 1948, by F. H. SOWARD.....	1
The Autonomy and Limitations of Historical Thought, by H. N. FIELDHOUSE	12
Les Arts au Canada sous le Régime Français, by GÉRARD MORISSET....	23
The Group of Seven in Canadian History, by LAWREN HARRIS.....	28
Cent Ans de Gouvernement à la Rivière Rouge, by l'abbé d'ESCHAM- BAULT	39
LaFontaine and 1848 in Canada, by Rev. V. J. JENSEN.....	46
1848 in Retrospect: Events in Nova Scotia and Canada, by R. S. LONGLEY	55
British Columbia's American Heritage, by WILLARD E. IRELAND.....	67
Canada and the New British Columbia, by MARGARET A. ORMSBY.....	74
A Bent Twig in British Columbia History, by W. KAYE LAMB.....	86
National Historic Parks and Sites, by the National Parks Service, Lands and Development Services Branch, Department of Mines and Resources.....	93
Report of the Secretary, by DAVID M. L. FARR.....	99
March of Books.....	101
Report of the Treasurer, by NORMAN FEE.....	102
List of Members and Affiliated Organizations.....	103

THEN AND NOW: 1848 AND 1948

Presidential Address by F. H. SOWARD
The University of British Columbia

THE past six months have witnessed a variety of centennial celebrations of the Revolutions of 1848 in Europe that offer an enlightening commentary on the political climate of our times. Thus in Hungary a special session of Parliament was convened to enact a bill to commemorate the War of Independence of 1848. Among the distinguished guests whose presence on this occasion was more a proof of solidarity under Soviet direction than of historical mindedness, were Marshal Voroshilov, the chief executive of the Ukrainian Republic, The vice-premier of Poland, and the ministers of Czechoslovakia and Yugoslavia. On March 15 the BBC. broadcast a message to the Hungarian people from the British foreign secretary, Mr. Bevin, in which he paid tribute to the heroes of Hungarian independence and to Louis Kossuth in particular for whom, he pointed out, Britain had been a safe refuge in the hour of danger. Mr. Bevin then added significantly "Now too, England is the friend of liberty and is fighting against tyranny from whatever source it may draw inspiration or whatever interests it may serve." The political overtones of his remarks were too much for the controlled Hungarian press which published the text of the message with appropriate bitter and sarcastic remarks. The Communist newspaper *Szavad Nep* declared that the broadcast displayed "complete contempt of the truth and hypocrisy of the highest degree." "Does Bevin think," it asked angrily, "that we have forgotten not only 1848 but 1938."

Distracted and divided Germany was not permitted to have a single centennial celebration. The Russians insisted that the anniversary should be observed in Berlin on March 18 to commemorate the riots which forced the king of Prussia, temporarily, to merge his kingdom into Germany. Under their supervision, a demonstration in honour of the "Day of Freedom" was accordingly staged. In Frankfort, where the German National Assembly met in 1848, the Americans were very much to the fore. The United States military governor proclaimed a half-holiday on May 16, the anniversary of the day when 330 members of that Assembly walked solemnly in procession to St. Paul's Church. He carefully drew attention to the fact that President Polk had been the only head of a state to send an official greeting to the Frankfort assembly and also reminded his wards that the United States had been the refuge of thousands of Germans after the failure of the Revolution. By tremendous efforts the bombed-out church was reconstructed for the occasion. At the ceremony, the principal speaker was Chancellor Hutchins of the University of Chicago. Both he and the lord mayor of Frankfort drew attention to the influence of American ideas on the men of 1848. Prominent among the special display of works of art and historic documents were photostat copies of the Declaration of Independence and the American Constitution.

In Paris, the centenary was, from our point of view, most appropriately observed by the convening of an international congress of historians at which papers were read on the events of 1848. The type of representation epitomized the political status of France today. There were no historians present from the two super-powers. British historians were there as private observers, but not as delegates—not a bad reflection of the British

attempt at semi-detachment from a continent which dominates their destiny. The smaller European countries were well represented but of the delegates from behind the "Iron Curtain" only the Hungarians were on time. The Czechs were one day late and the Poles three. Professor Taylor of the University of Manchester, who was one of the few British historians present and to whom I am indebted for this summary, describes the general views expressed as follows:

The countries of Western Europe repeated the French version of 1848—that is their delegates talked almost exclusively of national independence and individual liberty. The Hungarians contributed something new in a social analysis of their revolutions; this infuriated the Czechs who insisted on the national conflicts of 1848. The Czechs, in fact, clung to an old fashioned Western approach; the Hungarians are preparing to be the equal partners of the Russians, as they once were of the Germans and before that of the Hapsburgs. There was only one Austrian, who remained silent. Apart from him the Germans were not represented; and it would have been possible to sit through the Congress almost without becoming aware that there had been an earth-shaking revolution in Germany in 1848 The Italians claimed, as it were, equality with France and Great Power status. Indeed they went further and asserted the primacy of the Italian revolutions of 1848. In their view the spirit of 1848 was most clearly expressed by Mazzini and it was his doctrine of nationalism which carried the day in Eastern Europe.¹

As has been indicated, the Italians were the first to revolt in 1848. Although Paris, Berlin, Vienna, Budapest, Prague, and Warsaw were all to experience riots and bloodshed, it was Milan on January 3 which witnessed the first clash between soldiers and civilians when five were killed and sixty wounded. "The Mourning of Lombardy" as D'Azeglio described it in his famous pamphlet of that name, aroused patriots everywhere, but only impelled the local authorities to issue a harsh imperial rescript that had been held in reserve for some time. The Milan demonstrations had been anti-Austrian and pro-Italian, a portent of the emotion which Mazzini had been cultivating for fifteen years. But the first successful revolt, announced in advance, took place in Palermo, Sicily on January 12. Here the rebels demanded freedom from the hated Neapolitans and the "English constitution of 1812." Their success induced middle-class liberals in Naples to clamour for the constitution of 1820 and thereafter an epidemic of constitution-making spread up the peninsula. The demonstrators of Palermo and Naples hated each other and were indifferent to the sufferings of Venice or Milan under the Austrian yoke. In that harsh fact is one of the basic reasons for the failure of 1848 in Italy. Local liberalism and Italian nationalism did not always stand on common ground. Similarly, the Italian sentiments of Pope Pius the Ninth, of which there is ample evidence, conflicted with the international role of the Papacy. Papal troops might proceed northward from Rome and link up with other forces eager to free Lombardy-Venetia from the Austrians but the Pope, as a temporal sovereign, as his Allocution of April 29 demonstrated, would not declare war on Austria. Even a Liberal Pope could not be a patriot king. As His Holiness declared "We, though unworthy, represent on earth Him who is the author

¹*Manchester Guardian Weekly*, Apr. 22, 1948.

of peace and lover of concord, and, according to the order of our supreme Apostolate, we seek after and embrace all races, peoples, and nations with an equal devotion of paternal love." The most Pope Pius could do was to write a personal appeal to the Austrian emperor exhorting him "with paternal affection to withdraw your arms from a war which can never reconquer for your empire the minds of the Lombards and Venetians" and begging the "generous German nation" to recognize the Italian nation "as a sister."²

The resulting reaction against the Pope's decision, coupled with the disappointing military leadership of the king of Piedmont, stimulated Mazzini's cult of republicanism and gave him the opportunity to direct the affairs of the Roman Republic. Of that beleaguered city, Garibaldi became the flashing sword. To him could fittingly be applied Macaulay's description of Chatham's leadership in the Seven Years' War—"The ardour of his soul had set the whole kingdom on fire." Incidentally, Garibaldi's famous remark to his followers when he was obliged to flee Rome, "I offer neither pay nor quarters, nor provisions; I offer hunger, thirst, forced marches, battle and death," may well have been the inspiration for the Churchillian remark on May 13, 1940, "I have nothing to offer but blood, toil, tears and sweat." The conflicts within Italy of regionalism and nationalism, of republicanism and monarchy, of nationalism and universalism, of fusion and federation, combined with incompetent military leadership, an oft-recurring motif in Italian history, made 1848 a year of failure for Italian unity. But out of failure came what Croce has described as "dazzling memories of heroic leadership" and "experience of the life of liberty" as well as a consolidation of opinion. Papal leadership of an Italian federation, once Gioberti's panacea, was discredited. Mazzini's dream of an Italian republic had been shattered and its author was to become one of the unhappiest of types—a frustrated exile. Anti-Austrian feeling had grown and correspondingly with it the prestige of Piedmont and Piedmont's king who had failed, but with honour. As Daniel Manin, the hero of the Venetian Republic was to write in 1856 . . . "the Republican Party . . . says to the House of Savoy, 'Make Italy and I am with you. If not, . . . no'." "We will begin again" was the saying in Piedmont and a new shrewd leader, Cavour, was anxiously waiting his cue in the wings. He knew that King Charles Albert's boast of 1848 "*L'Italia farà da sé*" had proved unreal and was waiting for the moment to find his ally against Austria in the very France that has smashed the Roman Republic. Cavour's model for the Italy of the future was to be Britain, of whom he said in 1859, "From England I have learned the greater part of the political notions which have guided me."

In the Italy of 1948 the Republicans have prevailed. It is presumably some of their historians who dusted off Mazzini's reputation for the edification of the Paris Congress. In the recent elections, with a tremendous turnout at the polls, the Monarchist vote was less than 3 per cent. The Papacy's leadership was exerted this time against Communism with the blunt reminder, "Who is not for Me is against Me." By some observers the influence of the Church has been ranked as the strongest single factor in defeating Togliatti and his followers. The other powerful factor was the influence of the United States, as expressed in the arrival of food ships,

²Quoted in G.F.-H. and J. Berkeley, *Italy in the Making*, January 1, 1848, November 16, 1848 (Cambridge, 1940), 334.

the proposed relaxation of the Peace Treaty, and by letters from Italo-Americans to the folks back home. Such an influence could not have been paralleled in 1848, even though American bluestockings like Margaret Fuller, who happened to be in Rome during the days of crisis, ardently encouraged the republican movement. But, in the rejoicing over the Communist set-back in April, it must not be forgotten that eight million Italians defied both Church and Mammon to vote for the Popular Front, and that they represent not merely the influence of the U.S.S.R. but a deep-seated social protest against wretched social conditions that have never been satisfactorily redressed. As a Canadian observer wrote from Rome after the elections,³ "The desperate Calabrian share cropper did not see why he could not be a good Catholic and a Communist at the same time." In 1948 Italy, in common with Western Europe is a battle ground between two ideas that are locked in as yet undetermined conflict. The One World of Communism confronts the United States of Western Europe of which perhaps "Western Union" is the forerunner. The next four years of the European Recovery Program may throw some light on which way Europe is moving.

In the France of 1848 currents of protest, strengthened by the lean harvests of the two previous years which had caused 1847 to be christened the year of dear bread, merged in general demonstrations against the bourgeois monarchy of Louis Philippe. His régime with its determined inertia, its cautious foreign policy, that bored the French just as forty years of peace was soon to bore the English, and its concentration upon money making, which made two critics as diverse in outlook as Karl Marx and Alexis de Toqueville agree in likening it to "an industrial company in which the operations are carried out for the benefits that the members can derive from them" was despised by all but those who directly profited from it. Among the victors over the citizen king were those like Lamartine, who looked back upon the first French Revolution with child-like adoration, and believed that France would live happily ever after once the new Republic had been consolidated. "We are making together the sublimest of poems," said Lamartine, joyfully. Elsewhere the poet-politician was prudent enough to declare that in the new republic charity would be diffused among the different classes in so far as it was compatible with "the liberty of capital and the security of property."

If Lamartine and his fellow idealists looked to the revolution of the past, Louis Blanc, Proudhon, and the followers of the various Socialist cults that had multiplied since 1820 were determined to establish the new social revolution in which the Second French Republic would be an agent of social justice. As Heine, an exile in Paris vainly warned the readers of his despatches, "Communism is the sombre hero for whom is reserved a huge, if transient role in the tragedy of our times." Indifferent to both protest groups were the great majority of France, the peasants whose agrarian revolution had long since been completed and for whom the best government was the one that taxed the least. Consequently, it soon proved impossible to stabilize such a republic directed by the uneasy coalition of bourgeois reformers with proletarian revolutionists. As early as May, while in Paris, Emerson was writing in his journal "The boulevards have lost their fine trees which were all cut down for barricades in February. At the end of a year we shall take account and see if the revolution was

³M. Halton, "Victory for the Vatican" (*Maclean's Magazine*, June 1, 1948, 60).

worth the trees." Six weeks later rural France had conquered working-class Paris and the way was paved for Louis Napoleon to win the presidency with promises of peace, order, and glory. Like his uncle before him, Napoleon III transformed a republic into an empire, but he lacked the former's physical vitality and military capacity to make the Second Empire as glorious as the first. What survived both the Second Republic and the Empire was universal manhood suffrage, which idealists were to learn did not guarantee democratic government, as Hitler was again to demonstrate, a distrust of the "strong silent man" and a separation of classes and of Paris from the country that the Commune of 1871 was only to intensify.

Of the resulting hate and bitterness Syndicalism and Marxian Socialism were to be the residuary legatees in France before the First World War, and Communism after it. As recently as December last a leader writer in the *Manchester Guardian* (December 4) wrote in an editorial on "The French Struggle" that "The Communists are exceedingly anxious to appear to be leading a working-class movement defending itself against such proceedings as those which made the streets of Paris in 1848 the cockpit of a dreadful battle." Two months ago the editor of the French newspaper *Combat* wrote an article for American consumption in which he commented that "In France the class struggle has been not an imported ideology, but the dire experience of proletarian families for over a century."⁴

The history of France since 1940 has been the story of a divided people still grappling with the unsolved problems of 1789 and 1848. At the opening of the decade they were led by an octogenarian soldier who detested the ideas of '89 and replaced the motto of the Third Republic, "Liberty, Equality, and Fraternity" with the safer slogan "Work, Family, Fatherland." Pétain was succeeded by another soldier, General Charles de Gaulle who seems to have thought of himself as a combination of a contemporary Joan of Arc saving France from the foreigner and a reincarnated Louis IX crusading against the Anti-Christ of Communism. Since his voluntary retirement from office in January, 1946 it has remained for Socialists like Auriol, Blum, and Ramadier and Catholic Democrats like Bidault and Schuman to attempt to save the Fourth Republic from the vague corporatism of De Gaulle and the equivocal communism of Thorez. But the middle way of Blum's "Third Force" has not been illumined by the fierce glare of publicity and propaganda that dazzles the traveller on the super highways of Capitalism and Communism. Meanwhile, in France, the peasant, the factory worker, the bourgeois, and the clerical have changed astonishingly little since 1848. There remains still that attitude which the French call "frondeur," that suspicion of authority, evasion of law, and dislike of collectivism that makes administration inefficient and undisciplined at a time when such luxuries are too expensive for an enfeebled country.⁵ While Frenchmen have changed little, the position of France has changed tremendously. The strength of France, in a demographic, a diplomatic, or a military sense is far from what it was a century ago. Then it was the rising in Paris, not the riot in Palermo, that touched off the chain reaction of revolution in Europe. "When France sneezes Europe has a cold" Metternich once complained. It was to France that both Marx and Mazzini

⁴Claude Bourdet, "The Battle for Post-War France" (*Harpers Magazine*, Apr., 1948, 318).

⁵See Harold Callender, "The Great Challenge that Confronts France" (*New York Times Magazine*, Dec. 7, 1947).

looked for sympathy and encouragement in 1848. Today France, like Italy, faces a crisis of civilization, uneasily and angrily aware that the great decisions will be made in Washington or Moscow and not in Paris. The claim of Jacques Soustelle that she "can play the rôle of a spiritual guide to the benefit of all the European Countries" does not carry conviction.⁶

When G. M. Trevelyan observed that "The year 1848 was the turning-point at which modern history failed to turn,"⁷ he had particularly in mind the tragedy of the failure in Central Europe. If, in that fatal year, Germany had been successfully united on democratic lines, the course of history might have run in far different channels and perhaps two world wars might have been avoided. These are sweeping but not fantastic speculations which a glance at the record may help to explain. At first sight it would appear that revolution in Germany had an easier task than in Austria or Italy. As a country, Germany was incomparably more homogeneous than the former while it was free from the incubus of an efficient army of occupation such as finally prevailed in the latter. It had nothing like the class bitterness between worker and bourgeois that operated so disastrously in Paris. True, Engels might tell Marx hopefully that in the Rhineland "one is always falling over Communists." Bad harvests and the "unfair" competition of machines with hand-loomers might embitter artisans and impell Count Galen, to write from Kassel in 1847, "Misery, spiritual and physical, traverses Europe in ghastly shapes—the one without God, the other without bread. Woe if they join hands."⁸ But the fact remains that the industrial revolution had scarcely affected Germany. In 1846 its largest state, Prussia, was 72 per cent rural as against 73.5 per cent thirty years before. Dissatisfied workers were radicals rather than class conscious proletarians. Occasionally it was the radicals who hastened action, as in Berlin, but invariably it was the middle-class liberals who took over at that point and set to work to realize the ideas of constitutional reform of which they had been balked after Waterloo. When the king of Württemberg explained to the Russian minister in his capital that he could not ride down ideas he expressed the dilemma of the petty German princelings everywhere. With the Austrian Emperor encouraging Metternich to leave Vienna for England and the King of Prussia declaring on March 21 that Prussia is henceforth merged into Germany, it looked as though a liberal constitutional Germany with universal suffrage was in the making. That was the bright promise of what the romantics called the "Völkersonnendunst" when the Frankfurt Assembly met in May. In its ranks were some of the noblest and best-educated figures in Germany—but only one peasant, a Pole from Silesia, and no working class spokesmen. "Too much of a university and not enough of a political stock exchange," was the verdict of one German historian on the Assembly. It spent precious time in debating the fundamental rights of the German people, with even the very first words of the Constitution "Every German" provoking a discussion lasting for hours as to the meaning of the word "German." One disgusted member calculated that at the present rate of speed the end of this discussion might be about April, 1930. The Assembly displayed a fiery German nationalism leaving,

⁶Jacques Soustelle, "France, Europe and Peace" (*Foreign Affairs*, Apr., 1948, 499).

⁷G. M. Trevelyan, *British History in the Nineteenth Century* (London, 1922), 292.

⁸See L. B. Namier, 1848: *The Revolution of the Intellectuals* (London, 1946), 4-7. V. Valentin, *Chapters of German History* (London, 1940), 147-8. A. J. P. Taylor, *The Course of German History* (London, 1945), 68-70.

as one orator said, "the misty heights of cosmopolitanism from which one's own fatherland is no longer visible," which reflected the disappointed aspirations of the men of 1815. The eagerness to create a German navy, the anger at the demonstrations of Czech nationalism in Prague, the desire to incorporate Schleswig-Holstein in Germany at the expense of Denmark, the disapproval of Polish requests for national autonomy in Posen were indications of a rising sentiment which Conservatives and militarists could and did later use for their purposes. It is easy to be too harsh in judging the German intellectuals of 1848, to point to the ludicrousness of some of their actions, and to compare them, as did the Russian exile, Herzen, to the playfulness of a cow "when that excellent and respectable animal, adorned with domestic kindness, takes to gambolling and galloping in the meadow, and with a serious face kicks up her hind legs or gallops sideways whipping herself with her tail." But it should be remembered that the men of Frankfort never found a leader with the ruthlessness of a Cromwell or the boldness of a Danton and never acquired an army which was loyal to them. Many of the ablest of Germans despised their efforts and held aloof. In some instances, like Bismarck they were Prussian chauvinists, not German patriots, who were eager to see the Frankfort experiment fail and the era of "blood and iron" inaugurated. "Prussians we are and Prussians we will remain," said the self-described "terrible Junker." "... I hope to God we shall remain Prussians long after this piece of paper has been forgotten like a withered autumn leaf." When the Hapsburgs regained a grip on their Empire, and when Frederick William IV of Prussia, "all nerves and muscle," refused to stoop to the gutter and pick up the crown offered him, the prospects for a liberal Germany vanished and have still to return.

What the middle class liberal and worker radical failed to accomplish by persuasion in Germany was achieved by force of arms. The prophecy of Prince William of Prussia in May of 1849, "He who is to govern Germany must conquer her," was soon fulfilled. Meanwhile, the Liberals of '48 emigrated by the thousands to the United States to play a worthy part in the struggle for freedom there, or returned to their laboratories and classrooms, or became admirers of force and realpolitik. The new class of industrial capitalists that speedily appeared never experimented with Liberal policies as did the Cobdens and Chamberlains; the new industrial proletariat promptly turned to Marx and the Social Democratic party and repudiated any alliance with bourgeois liberals such as the workers of Britain found to their advantage in the days of Gladstone and Asquith. What professor Valentin calls the authoritative state took over in Germany and taught its subjects to rejoice in their political incompetence. "Since 1848," he writes, "Germans have suffered from political inferiority complexes. They had lost confidence in themselves and never found it again."⁹

For the triumph of the cult of force and the denial of political responsibility, Germany and the world have paid dearly. A Germany built by Bismarck showed no consideration for Frenchmen, Danes, and Poles in the conquered provinces and inaugurated the period of armed peace in Europe that was shattered by the First World War. A Germany ruined by the Kaiser and the German General Staff found no great leader to guide the Weimar Republic which succumbed in days of economic depression to the

⁹Valentin, *Chapters of German History*, 429.

senile treachery of another Prussian soldier, Hindenburg, and the cunning of an Austrian spell-binder. Again political immaturity in Germany was dislodged by nationalism and force, with a fictitious veneer of State Socialism, and again force destroyed Germany and Europe—this time more thoroughly. The men of 1948 in Germany have still to be given a third chance to remould their country. Will they be able or be allowed to profit by the mistakes of their forebears of 1848 and 1918?

In 1848 the Austrian Empire was a medley of discordant nationalities¹⁰ some of whom, like the Italians, Poles, and Hungarians, regarded themselves as historic nations or master races, while others, like the Czechs, Croats, Rumanians, and Ruthenians were either regaining or achieving national consciousness. At the centre of the Empire was the imperial administration under the aged and pessimistic Metternich whose favourite metaphors for describing the state of society were "powder magazines, influenza, and cholera."¹¹ Obeying his master's directive he operated on the principle of changing nothing and admitted "J'ai gouverné l'Europe quelquefois, L'Autriche jamais." As elsewhere, economic discontent was increasing in the Empire with the peasant particularly resentful at the survivals of serfdom and feudal restraints. Yet there was no deep sense of proletarian solidarity. In March the mob which attacked property in Vienna destroyed factory machinery which, in Luddite fashion, it regarded as the enemy.¹² In fact, as Professor Taylor has pointed out, in Western and Central Europe it was the two most industrialized countries, Britain and Belgium, which were least affected by the events of 48.¹³

What was resented in Vienna by the students, some middle class, and radical workers was the police state atmosphere so well described in a pamphlet entitled *Austria and her Future* published anonymously in 1843 by a certain Baron Victor von Andrian-Werburg. "The citizen," commented the noble official, "may be as jolly as he likes, get drunk, tell obscene stories, read a snippet theatrical journal, even found a cotton factory—but he must show no interest in his parish, his province or the state, or in the important questions of the day, however nearly they may affect his pocket or menace his very existence—he must ignore all this for fear of causing the gentlemen of the government any inconvenience."¹⁴

The fall of Metternich on March 13, attacked by reformers and abandoned in true Hapsburg fashion by those he had served so long, was the signal for demonstrations and uprisings from Berlin to Budapest and from Prague to Milan. For three months the imperial régime gave ground before the flood tides of liberalism and nationalism. "What remains standing in Europe?" was the gloomy question Czar Nicholas I addressed to Queen Victoria on April 3. In Italy Marshal Radetzky withdrew to the Quadrilateral, in Germany an Austrian archduke became temporary administrator of the proposed new German state, in Budapest the Hungarians achieved full autonomy, and in Prague, to the disgust of the Germans, a congress of

¹⁰A contemporary writer estimated the racial percentages about 1850 as follows: German 23, Czechoslovak 19, Magyar 14, Italian, Ruthene and Rumanian 8 each, Polish 7, Serb 5, Slovene and Croat 4 each. Namier, 1848, 101.

¹¹E. L. Woodward, *Three Studies in European Conservatism* (London, 1929), 31.

¹²Namier, 1848, 4-7, 11-12.

¹³A. J. P. Taylor, "1848: A Year of Revolution" (*Manchester Guardian Weekly*, Jan. 8, 1948).

¹⁴Quoted in Valentin, *Chapters of German History*, 20.

Slav peoples was convened which was to adopt a resolution favouring "an alliance in defence of nationality . . . where such rights are enjoyed, and for conquering them where they are not." But there was no unity of policy among the new autonomous groups, there was a sad lack of effective leadership,¹⁵ and there was no tolerance of one nation by another. The Magyars insisted upon their hegemony at the expense of the Croats, Slovaks, and Rumanians. The Polish gentry were still bitter at the memory of the unholy alliance of Ruthenian peasant and Hapsburg official in 1846. The Germans and Czechs could not find enough common ground in Prague. All agreed in disliking the Italians and willingly fought under Radetzky to recover imperial authority in Lombardy-Venetia. A loyal army,¹⁶ except in Hungary, the appearance of able Conservative leaders like Windishgrätz and Schwarzenberg and the elevation to the throne of Francis Joseph, of a lad of eighteen free from the physical and mental weakness of his uncle and quite prepared to break his solemn promises when convenient, combined to redress the balance. At the same time the peasants in all parts of the empire were bought off by agrarian concessions which were among the few lasting reforms of the period. There were isolated instances of solidarity in revolt as when Vienna rose in October to try to prevent German regiments from being sent to Budapest. There were heroic struggles to the last as in Venice, or in Hungary where the Czar of Russia intervened, only too eager to pour out Russian blood to prevent workers from governing Europe or a centre of insurrection from appearing right at his door. But the end product was the same. By 1850 the Hapsburg empire had been restored intact, more efficient, more centralized, and, as its ambassador told Louis Napoleon in 1858, more devoted to the principle "the respect due to the imprescriptible rights of sovereigns and non-recognition of the claim of nationalities to set up as political States." Yet everywhere nationalism had been stimulated by defeat.¹⁷ Kossuth and Mazzini had failed but Deák, Bismarck, and Cavour were to achieve success in the next two decades, each profiting by a foreign war into which the Hapsburgs were ensnared. The Slav peoples were left still in bondage but their turn was to come in 1918 when the Hapsburgs were successful in their third attempt at state suicide.

Today the greater part of the former Hapsburg possessions has passed into the Soviet sphere of influence. The follies of an Austrian German who hated the Hapsburgs because they were not true German patriots and merged his homeland into the German fatherland have left Central Europe a vacuum into which Slav power has rapidly penetrated. The Republic of Austria cannot claim to be the spiritual heir of Austria-Hungary, Imperial Austria, or the Holy Roman Empire but it has become, as a thousand years ago, the Ostmark which is an outpost of the West against the East. Michael Bakunin, who advocated in 1848 a federation of Slav peoples from the Urals to the Adriatic has been vindicated by a Soviet régime which champions

¹⁵Trevelyan has commented on Kossuth that "it may be doubted whether any man since Robespierre did so much injury to the Liberal cause."

¹⁶Croce quotes the saying of the Austrian poet that "Austria was in Radetzky's camp" as an exact definition and historical condemnation of the empire. See Benedetto Croce, *History of Europe in the Nineteenth Century* (London, 1934), 186.

¹⁷As Namier puts it ". . . nationality, the passionate breed of the intellectuals invades the politics of Central and East-Central Europe and with 1848 starts the Great European War of every nation against its neighbours." Namier, 1848, 33.

Slavs, proletarians, and even peasants who may soon be encouraged to learn the virtues of collective farming. The Czech historian, Francis Palacky, who declined an invitation to attend the Frankfort parliament and added "When I direct my gaze beyond the frontier of Bohemia . . . I turn it not towards Frankfort but towards Vienna," may well be read with mournful interest today by those students of Prague who are now too politically unreliable to attend lectures in the national university.

It is obvious from what has been said that the men of 1848 were far from successful in securing their political and social objectives. As Crane Brinton has pointed out, they left much unfinished business on the European agenda.¹⁸ Although Europe then felt a certain sense of community, Russia and the Balkans excepted, it was to be largely preoccupied for a century with completing the process of nation building that the peacemakers of 1815 had blithely flouted. In the same period it was to be likewise concerned with the "Condition of the People" question that Dickens and Disraeli, or Carlyle and the Chartists were ventilating in England. But in spite of failure in '48 the European remained an optimist. Mazzini never lost faith in his belief that nation-states were instruments of God which would serve all humanity. Marx, whose influence on the events of 1848 was almost nil, but whose Communist Manifesto was the most important event of the year, was equally convinced that victory was on the side of the proletariat and was not far distant. In his eagerness for the future he assumed too readily that "complete laissez-faire and complete collectivism exhausted the alternatives" and, as we know only too well, terribly underestimated the dangers of totalitarianism.¹⁹ Victorian England, free from Revolution, was entering upon its golden era of prosperous capitalism and was soon to open its Great Exhibition with a hymn to material progress. Across the Atlantic a young and exuberant American republic was convinced that it had found the ideal form of government and had achieved a fully democratic society, even though a few radicals inveighed against the contemporary alliance of the Slave Power and the Money Power. In his farewell address President Polk dwelt proudly "on the sublime moral spectacle presented to the world by our beloved country." Not long after, Secretary of State Daniel Webster was to tell the effete Hapsburgs who had disliked American enthusiasm for the Hungarian revolution that "the power of this republic at the present moment is spread over a region, one of the richest and most fertile on the globe, and of an extent in comparison with which the possessions of the House of Hapsburg are but as a patch on the earth's surface." Science had begun in Europe its enunciation of universal laws and development of the scientific method which, as Whitehead has demonstrated, made the nineteenth century rival the seventeenth in accomplishment. In short, the western world was living in what had been called the "Century of Hope."

No such cheery phrase can be applied to the world of our time. On the contrary, Arnold Toynbee has described it as the "Time of Troubles," an age in which the idea of progress has been replaced by the fatalistic belief that change may only bring decay and destruction. Europe has more nearly attained the nation-state than at any time in its history but it has also learned at a frightful cost what a hellish force nationalism based upon racial-

¹⁸Crane Brinton "1848 and 1948—Lessons of a Century Ago" (*New York Times Magazine*, Apr. 11, 1948, 11).

¹⁹Sidney Hook, "The Communist Manifesto 100 Years After" (*New York Times Magazine*, Feb. 11, 1948, 6).

ism may become. It knows that nationalism cannot be exterminated unless the nation is groping for a wider conception which may harmonize cultural and social expressions of nationalism with a larger political and economic unit than the nation-state. With its European Economic Commission of eighteen states, including the U.S.S.R., established in Geneva, its organization for European Economic Cooperation for seventeen states including Western Germany in Paris, its Permanent Organ of the Consultative Council of five states of Western Europe located in London, the troubled continent is entering upon an era of consolidation that will certainly not come as quickly as its most ardent advocates would wish but is in the making. The Congress of Europe which assembled in the Hague a few weeks ago, was more accurately a congress of Europeans, as one observer pointed out, but it was more than a meeting of visionaries and exiles. With a Churchill as honorary chairman and political leaders from a dozen countries participating in its discussions, its resolutions reached a certain measure of importance that can not be casually dismissed. What impelled the men of the Hague to debate the federation of Europe was not only a sense of community but a feeling of desperation. The five million ghosts of Auschwitz, Buchenwald, and the Ghetto of Warsaw, the unfortunates of London or Hiroshima obliterated by a V2 or an atom bomb, are silent witnesses to the thin crust of our civilization. It is no wonder that science which once gave man a sense of exhilaration and excessive self-confidence has now made him the most uneasy of animals. He has begun to feel as the French scientist, and Nobel Prize winner, De Broglie has said that "the progress of our civilization, like our individual lives, seems to resemble a daily struggle with the certainty of final defeat." If Science no longer offers comfort, even to its own, Communism has also no gift of consolation except for those who have surrendered all power of analysis and criticism. Those who claim to be the only true heirs of Marx direct a state which, far from withering away, has become the Great Leviathan of our time. What Leon Blum calls their "idolatrous fanaticism" has made the Soviet Union the exponent of a new imperialism which Prime Minister Attlee charged in a broadcast with being far more intolerant of opposition than the kings and emperors of a century ago. Apparently Soviet rulers do not believe that individual liberty and social justice can walk arm in arm and in the name of the latter destroy the former. As a result of their present tactics, of which the manifestos issued by the Cominform are an illustration, men of the most widely different points of view are being unwillingly driven into the same camp. Bevin and Franco, the Pope and Bertrand Russell, the President of the National Association of Manufacturers in the United States and Professor Laski are unexpected comrades.

And yet the man of 1848 and the man of 1948 have much in common. Both are conscious of injustice and eager to remedy it. Both refuse to be passive victims of a society which does not offer them the good life to which they feel man is entitled. In the struggles of 1848 the lack of wise leadership and the absence of unity of purpose brought to naught the hopes and aspirations of millions. Will that be the verdict of the future historian upon the struggles of our time?

THE AUTONOMY AND LIMITATIONS OF HISTORICAL THOUGHT

By H. N. FIELDHOUSE
McGill University

THERE is little in this paper which is original. It is meant to bring before our two associations some elements in the ideas of history which have been put forward by two philosophers—R. G. Collingwood in Oxford and Michael Oakeshott in Cambridge.¹ I have called the paper “The Autonomy and Limitations of Historical Thought,” and if it might be said, briefly, that Collingwood emphasizes the autonomy, and Oakeshott the limitations, that is not to say, of course, that Collingwood does not imply limitations, nor that Oakeshott, within the frame of his own definitions, does not affirm an autonomy.

It cannot be said that philosophers have concerned themselves over-much with history, nor historians with philosophy. After the long² speculation about the nature of historical thought in the period which stretched from Descartes through Vico to Hegel, the later nineteenth century brought the rule of positivism, with its step-children, the identification of history with natural evolution, and the attempt to find historical “laws” on the analogy of natural laws; and, confronted with this development, the more reflective among historians said, in effect: “If this be philosophy of history, we want none of it.” But to turn our backs on the question of the relation of philosophy to history under the impression that positivism was all that there was of philosophy, was to act as did Mr. Shaw when he turned his youthful back on Christianity under the impression (it is alleged) that Belfast Protestantism was all that there was of Christianity: and now that the long winter of positivism has broken up, we can reach back beyond it to ask, as does Collingwood: “What is historical thinking?”—and—“What light does it throw on the traditional problems of philosophy?”

The question has to be asked because when, in the last one hundred and fifty years, history began to be regarded as a special form of thought, encountering its own difficulties and devising its own methods to meet them, it did so in a world in which the current theories of knowledge had little or nothing to say to it.³ They accounted for knowledge as it is understood by those sciences of observation in which it is treated as a relation between a

¹Especially in R. G. Collingwood, *The Idea of History* (Oxford, 1946) and in Michael Oakeshott, *Experience and its Modes* (Cambridge, 1933). Except where it is otherwise stated, quotations in the paper are from, and references in the notes are to, these two works.

²Long but not very fruitful. The Cartesian schools condemned history as being able to deal only with testimony, and while there was a sufficiency of idealist philosophies of history, they were not notably philosophic in their treatment of the question of historical knowledge. The tendency of such philosophies is to take human history as given, and to pay little attention to the prior question of how we know what that history has been. It is one thing to recognize the inter-dependence of philosophy and history, and another to construct philosophies of history; and historians have been frightened away from philosophy because philosophies of history have meant either history as the self-revelation of some Absolute (as with Hegel) or history as empirical science (as with Comte, Spencer, and Buckle).

³Collingwood points out that philosophies tend to reflect the intellectual pre-occupations of the period in which they are constructed. Greek philosophy placed mathematics in the centre of the picture; mediaeval philosophy, theology; modern philosophy, the natural sciences.

subject and an object confronting one another; and they provided for the abstract thought which is characteristic of exact sciences such as mathematics. But history is unlike the sciences of observation in that, while they deal with events which are perceptible, history deals with actions which are no longer perceptible; and it is unlike mathematics, in that the latter deals with the abstract and the universal, and history with the concrete and the particular: so that when we are offered theories of knowledge which explain either acquaintance with transient events or reasoned knowledge of abstract universals, we still have to explain a third form of knowledge—historical thought—which seeks a reasoned knowledge of what is at once transient, concrete, and no longer susceptible of direct observation.

The last two decades, however, have brought a very noticeable realization that philosophy and history are inter-dependent. We historians will admit that we beg all manner of philosophical questions. We try to apprehend the unique and the singular, often without asking whether—if there are merely uniqueness and singularity—it is possible to apprehend them. We work with “individuals” (such as this or that empire) which we get from convenience and commonsense, and with “universals” which are seldom more than the empirical groupings of facts related in time; and into any field of thought beyond that of events in time, we usually feel no occasion to venture. On their side—and while insisting that philosophical questions are not, *qua* philosophical, historical—there are some philosophers, at least, who are disposed to think that philosophy has been over-much concerned with exact and natural science, and would gain by taking account of the concrete knowledge which is sought by history.⁴ For such philosophers, it is not a question of fitting history into existing systems, but of asking, as does Professor Alexander, how philosophical thinking is affected by the historical nature of things. In Collingwood’s terms, we have to take account of the development in historical thinking which has taken place since Kant, as Kant took account of the development in scientific thinking which had taken place since Descartes.

I

Such an undertaking would ask two questions about history—the question of the *nature* of historical knowledge, and the question of the place of history in the field of knowledge generally. Collingwood would almost certainly have contended that the two inquiries cannot be separated, but if we may be permitted to separate them (merely as a device in exposition), we may, perhaps, suggest that Collingwood’s chief contribution is to the analysis of the nature of historical inquiry, and Oakeshott’s to the discussion of the relation of history to other forms of knowledge.

This paper is meant to bring out three aspects of the work of these two philosophers which seem, to the writer, to be important for historians and social scientists in contemporary Canada. It cannot, in the time available, deal in full with their respective “systems,” but something must be said of those “systems” if what follows is to be intelligible. Briefly, Oakeshott draws, from the premises of philosophic idealism, the conclusion that history is defective philosophy. Collingwood draws, from the premises of

⁴See W. G. de Burgh, “Philosophy and History” (*Hibbert Journal*, London, XXXV, 1936-7).

philosophic scepticism, the conclusion that history is the only kind of knowledge and that philosophy is "incapsulated" in it.

In Oakeshott's terms, history is a mode, or modification, of experience.⁵ Experience itself "is a single whole . . . which admits of no final or absolute division." It is a world, and what differentiates a world is unity.⁶ The idea of unity, however, remains imperfect so long as it is separated from the idea of completeness:⁷ and "experience remains incomplete until the world of ideas is so far coherent as not to suggest, or oblige, another way of conceiving it."

What is ultimately satisfactory in experience, then, is a completely coherent world of concrete ideas,⁸ and where this concrete purpose is pursued without qualification, there we have philosophy.⁹ It is possible to turn aside, however, from the attempt to construct such a world (the business of philosophy), and to rest content (as, in Oakeshott's view, and from the standpoint of the totality of experience, do the scientist, the historian, and the practical man) with the construction and exploration of a restricted world of abstract ideas. It is such turnings aside which Oakeshott calls divergences from, or arrests in, experience, and it is these restricted worlds which he calls modes of experience.¹⁰

Oakeshott holds, then, that both science and history are defective philosophy, or, more accurately, that what science and history study are abstractions from what philosophy studies. Collingwood began by defending both philosophy and history against natural science, but he ended by identifying philosophy and history. He began by defending philosophy against the positivist tendency to absorb it in natural science, and by insisting that history produces results which are as worthy to be called knowledge as are those which are produced by science: but he went on to claim for history a position which seems to be much what the positivists had

⁵By experience, Oakeshott means the concrete whole which includes both experiencing and what is experienced. He does not condemn the attempt to analyse experience so as to distinguish between sensation, reflection, volition, etc., but argues that these are only devices of analysis, "lifeless abstractions" (pp. 9-10).

⁶The "given" in experience—that is, the recognized and understood—is always given in order to be transformed. It is not given to be acquiesced in, but to be criticized and elucidated. By such elucidation, we pass from the given to the achieved, and what differentiates the world of ideas achieved from that of ideas given in experience, is a greater degree of unity.

⁷"In experience what is established is the necessary character of a world of ideas; and no judgement is satisfactory until it is an assertion, the grounds of which are both complete and seen to be complete. . . . A unity achieved without regard to completeness is both arbitrary and precarious; and a whole which is all-inclusive and yet not a unity is a contradiction" (p. 33).

⁸When Oakeshott affirms that experience is a world of ideas, he is not, of course, affirming that it is either a world of mere mental events, or a world of mere ideas. He is affirming that "there is . . . no experiencing which is not thinking . . . and consequently no experience which is not a world of ideas" (p. 26).

⁹"Philosophy . . . means experience without reservation or pre-supposition, experience which is self-conscious and self-critical throughout, in which the determination to remain unsatisfied with anything short of a completely coherent world of ideas is absolute and unqualified" (p. 82). Lest anyone should be tempted to suspect arrogance here, be it added that Oakeshott notes that "philosophy, experience for its own sake, is a mood, and one which, if we are to live this incurably abstract life of ours, must frequently be put off" (p. 83).

¹⁰If we agree that history and science are the products of different categorical selections from concrete experience, and are bound, therefore, to be but partial, does it follow that, as Oakeshott appears to say, they have nothing to give to philosophy?

claimed for science. In a passage which is quoted by his editor, he implies that only history is genuine knowledge.

Logic [he wrote] is an attempt to expound the principles of what in the logician's own day passed for valid thought; ethical theories differ but none of them is therefore erroneous, because any ethical theory is an attempt to state the kind of life regarded as worth aiming at, and the question always arises, by whom? Natural science indeed is distinct from history and, unlike philosophy, cannot be absorbed into it, but this is because it starts from certain presuppositions and thinks out their consequences, and since these presuppositions are neither true nor false, thinking these together with their consequences is neither knowledge nor error.

This is not historical relativism as that term is usually understood. It is complete historicism with regard to all knowledge.

II

The first aspect of Collingwood's work which I wish to mark is his vindication of historical thought as self-determining, self-dependent, and self-justifying. To the question, "What is historical thinking?", the commonsense (and, if I may use the term, undergraduate) answer is that history depends on authority. The historian, having decided upon the event about which he wishes to know, is supposed to begin by going in search of statements about that event by "authorities," and then to make those statements his own.¹¹ Actually, the historian is so far from relying on authorities to whose statements he must conform, that, at all stages of his work, he is his own authority, and his thought contains a criterion to which his authorities must conform, and by reference to which they are criticized.¹² For if he has it in his power to reject what his authorities tell him (and he has this power), it follows that the criterion of historical truth cannot be that a statement is made by an authority. If the historian accepts what his authorities say, it is not on their authority, but on his own: because it satisfies his criterion of historical truth.¹³

¹¹"The search for and the collection of documents is . . . logically the first and most important part, of the historian's craft. . . . After the collection of facts comes the search for causes" (C. V. Langlois and C. Seignobos, *Introduction to the Study of History*, New York, 1932, quoted in Oakeshott, 96).

¹²In the process of criticism, he puts his authorities to the question, in the Baconian sense, extracting from them evidence which they did not know they possessed or which they were unwilling to give. In the process of construction, his sources may seem to supply him with fixed points, but it is he who interpolates the connection between these points by means of legitimate inference. In the process of selection, it is he, and not his authorities, who decides upon what goes into his narrative and what is excluded from it.

Collingwood defines history as a science whose business is to study events which are not accessible to our observation, and to do this *inferentially*. By legitimate inference is meant inference which contains nothing which is not necessitated by the evidence. The historian may claim no piece of knowledge unless he can exhibit the grounds of his claim to anyone who is both able and willing to follow the demonstration. That (i) historical knowledge is not the reception of external impression, but involves inference and judgment; and (ii) that this is no reason for scepticism about the possibility of historical knowledge were securely established, we may suppose, by F. H. Bradley. See "The Pre-suppositions of Critical History" (in *Collected Essays*, Oxford, 1935).

¹³Cf. Oakeshott, 97. "The collection of materials is certainly not the first step in history. And the data of the historian are certainly not facts. . . . What is given in history, what is original from the standpoint of logic, is a system of postulates."

It remains to ask—"What is his criterion of historical truth?" Collingwood's answer is that given by the exercise of a *a priori* imagination, in the sense of constructive imagination, or of historical thought itself. If I reject a statement of Lutz about Sir Edward Grey, it is because my reconstruction of Grey's policy, based on historical thinking about other sources, will not let me think that Lutz is correct; because what he says cannot be fitted into the coherent and continuous picture which I have formed of Grey.¹⁴

Nothing is admissible, then, except what is necessary, and the criterion of necessity is a *a priori* imagination. The picture constructed by that imagination, however, must satisfy two conditions: it must be consistent with itself,¹⁵ and it must stand in a certain relation to what we call evidence.

If we ask what evidence is, Collingwood replies that everything is evidence which the historian can use as such. The whole perceptible world is *potential* evidence, and it becomes *actual* evidence in so far as the historian can use it: and he can use it only if he comes to it with the right kind of historical knowledge. Evidence is only historical evidence when someone looks at it historically. Until then, it is only perceived "fact"—historically silent.

We reach, then, the affirmation, from the point of view of method, that historical knowledge can only grow out of historical knowledge, and, from the point of view of philosophy, that historical thinking is an original and fundamental activity of the human mind, and the idea of the past, an *innate idea*.¹⁶

Before leaving this point, for the moment, we may notice that Collingwood anticipates two ways in which his views might be construed in such a way as to give material for historical scepticism. In principle, his act of the historical imagination should use the entire perceptible present as evidence for the entire past. In practice, we can neither perceive the entire present nor envisage the entire past. To say this, however, is only to confess the gap which must exist for the historian between what is attempted in principle and what is achieved in practice. The same gap exists in science, in philosophy, and, as Collingwood adds, in the pursuit of happiness.

Secondly, it follows from Collingwood's premise that the evidence available for the solution of any question will vary with every change in historical method and with the competence of every historian. Not only do historians find new answers to old questions; they must also ask new questions, so that every generation must re-write history. But, again, this "is only the discovery of a second dimension of historical thought, the history of history: the discovery that the historian himself, together with the here-and-now which forms the total body of evidence available to him, is a part of

¹⁴Cf. Oakeshott, 116, "The ground . . . of a belief in an historical event is neither that . . . it is asserted by a contemporary, nor that it is attested by an eye-witness, but is an independent judgement we make, based upon . . . our entire world of experience, about the capacity of the event to enhance or decrease the coherence of our world of experience as a whole. The grounds of our historical belief are not two—conformity with our own experience and the testimony of others' experience—they are our single world of experience taken as a whole."

¹⁵Since there is only one historical world, and everything in it must stand in some relation to everything else, even if the relation be only one of time and place.

¹⁶That is, "It is not a chance product of psychological causes; it is an idea which every man possesses as part of the furniture of his mind, and discovers himself to possess in so far as he become conscious of what it is to have a mind" (p. 248). "Historical thinking is that activity of the imagination by which we endeavour to provide this innate idea with detailed content" (p. 247).

the process he is studying . . . and [that he] can see it only from the point of view which at this present moment he occupies within it" (p. 248).

III

The second achievement of Oakeshott and Collingwood which concerns us here is their vindication of history as a form of knowledge distinct from natural science. To say this implies, of course, no denigration of science. As Collingwood points out, positivism raised the methods of natural science to the level of a universal method, so that criticism of positivism could be easily misrepresented as being an attack on science, when, in truth, it was only a protest against a theory which limited the mind to the kind of thinking which was characteristic of natural science, and against the proposition that natural science was the only kind of knowledge.

While both Oakeshott and Collingwood assert history's independence of science, they do so on different grounds. As we have seen, Collingwood appeared to move from a position in which he held that philosophy and science fall outside history, to one in which philosophy is absorbed in history while science remains outside it; whereas Oakeshott holds that both science and history are defective philosophy. Collingwood marks off history from science, therefore, by distinguishing between historical process and natural process. Oakeshott marks them one from another on the ground that each is an abstract world of ideas based upon its own postulates, and so irrelevant to the other.

Collingwood finds the origin of the confusion between history and science in the period in which scientists ceased to think of Nature as a static system and began to think of it as evolutionary. Since both forms of knowledge were now held to have a subject-matter which was essentially progressive,¹⁷ it became easier to blur, if not to abolish, the distinction between natural and historical process. This commerce was dangerous: for if the evolutionists appeared to reduce nature to history, the positivists appeared to reduce history to nature; to hold that mind was not different from nature; that historical process was in kind like natural process; and that the methods of natural science, therefore, were applicable to history.

The results of this assumption have been too manifold to be explored in this paper.¹⁸ What we are concerned with, here, is Oakeshott's implied criticism of this assumption, in terms of an idealist philosophy, and Collingwood's direct criticism of it in terms of an historical thought which is idealist in the sense of criticizing its own principles from within.

The twin assumptions which underlay positivist history were that each "fact" is to be regarded as something to be known by a separate act of cognition, and that each "fact" is independent, not only of other "facts," but also of the knower. As we have seen, with Oakeshott, however, a "fact" is given in order to be transformed, and a more complete fact is achieved by the transformation of what is given. "To be a fact means to have found

¹⁷Previously, the subject-matter of history had been essentially progressive, that of natural science, essentially static.

¹⁸The notion that historical process is dependent on an evolutionary law of nature contributed to the unhappy idea of history as automatic progress. The double notion, first, that history could be assimilated to science, and, secondly, that what the scientist does is first to ascertain facts and then to frame laws, has been responsible for most of the anti-historical tendencies in the social sciences. See, also, Collingwood on the naturalistic science of Spengler (p. 181), and of Professor Toynbee (p. 159).

a necessary place in a world of ideas." This is the general character of fact, and historical fact conforms to it. There cannot be isolated facts in history because there are no isolated facts in experience. "An isolated fact, without world or relation, is a fact not yet made, a fact without significance, a contradiction. Whenever in history a fact is asserted, the world in which this fact is involved is asserted also . . ." (p. 112).

For both scientist and historian, then, a particular, as such, is unintelligible. Before it can serve as data, it must be understood. But whereas for the scientist, the event achieves intelligibility by being perceived from the outside, and assigned to a class,¹⁹ for the historian, the event must be understood from the inside. When the natural scientist asks why a certain action takes place, he is, in effect, asking on what kind of occasion does the action take place. When the historian asks why Alexander I came to terms with Napoleon, he is asking: "What did Alexander think which led him to come to terms with Napoleon?" Natural process is a sequence of events; historical process is a process of thought; and, as we have seen, Collingwood holds that the historian discovers past thought by re-thinking it in his own mind in the present.²⁰

It follows, first, that the actions which the historian is studying are "not spectacles to be watched, but experiences to be lived through in his own mind; they are objective, or known to him, only because they are also subjective, or activities of his own" (p. 218).

It follows, secondly, that historicity is not merely a function of time. If, as Collingwood asserts, the historian is concerned with thoughts—that is with actions only as the external expression of thought—it follows that, in one sense, these thoughts are events occurring in time, but that, in another sense (since the only way in which the historian can discover them is by re-thinking them in his own mind), they are not in time at all. They can be apprehended by historical thought at any time.

Collingwood's distinction between science and history proceeds, therefore, from his idea of history as thought. Oakeshott distinguishes them because both are, in his view, abstract worlds (that is, abstractions from the totality of experience), the character of each being dependent upon its own presuppositions.

We must recall that, with Oakeshott, a mode of experience is not a separable part of reality²¹ (there are no such separable parts), but the

¹⁹This is Collingwood's view. Oakeshott places less emphasis on the scientific task of classification. Indeed, if the view that science is concerned with classification is also held to imply that the facts of nature dictate the classes under which they are explained, he roundly condemns it. For him, science is an attempt to find and elucidate a world of ideas which shall be stable, common, and communicable. It follows that this purpose limits science to the elucidation of a world of quantitative conceptions, "Whatever cannot be conceived quantitatively cannot belong to scientific knowledge" (p. 221).

²⁰To simplify: (a) Natural science deals with events, and history, with actions. (b) Actions differ from events because they involve thought. As occurring in the physical world, actions have an "outside," and as expressions of thought, they have an "inside." (c) What makes historical knowledge possible is the fact that past actions have had this "inside." The historian can re-enact the thoughts which constituted this inside. (d) This process of re-enactment is single: it is not to be divided into the two steps of finding out what happened, and then asking, in the light of general principles, why it happened. Historical actions are unique, and in answering the question "What," the historian answers the question "Why."

²¹See Oakeshott, 66-9 for his view that experience, truth and reality are inseparable.

whole of reality from a limited standpoint, and that to say that a mode of experience is abstract, is not to say that it is a different *kind* of experience from any other, but that it is experience "arrested" at a certain point and creating, at that point, a homogeneous²² world of ideas. Theoretically, there need be no limit to the number of such worlds, and what distinguishes each of them is the postulate on which it is constructed. Thus, scientific experience is the world "*sub specie quantitatis*," and its differentia is the attempt to organize the world of experience as a system of measurements. Practical experience is the world "*sub specie voluntatis*," and its differentia is the attempt to change the conditions of existence. Historical experience is the world "*sub specie praeteritorum*," and its differentia is the attempt to organize the world of experience in the shape of past events.

It follows, from this definition of experience and of its modes, that the latter are independent of one another. On the one hand, there is the concrete world of experience, the complete world which is implied by every abstract world, and from which such abstract worlds derive their significance; and, on the other hand, there are the abstract worlds, each a separate attempt (from a limited standpoint) to give coherence to the totality of experience, each a specific organization of experience exclusive of any other organization. "No experience save that which belongs exclusively to its mode can help to elucidate the contents of an abstract world of ideas; the experience which belongs to another mode is merely irrelevant. . . ."²³

Confusion between the worlds of historical and practical experience takes its most familiar form in the view that the aim of history is to explain the present.²⁴ Confusion between the worlds of historical and scientific experience²⁵ takes its most conspicuous form in the post-Comtean notion that the historian is to discover the facts, and that some sort of social scientist is to discover the connection between the facts by thinking "scientifically" about the same facts with which the historian is supposed to work empirically. As Collingwood points out, the results have not been science, but eschatology;²⁶ and universal histories constructed on such "scientist" lines have either passed into the curiosa of historiography or, where they have survived, as in the case of Marxism, have done so not because they are scientifically cogent, but because they have become the creeds of secular religions.

²²Homogeneous because every mode of experience is still a form of experience, and each abstract world seeks, not to escape from experience, but to be judged by the criterion of experience, that is by the principle of coherence.

²³Oakeshott, 81. For his illustrations of the confusion which attends on the attempt to pass from one abstract world to another, see 75-7, 80-1, 100-1, 156-68.

²⁴See Professor Beard's introduction to *Theory and Practice in Historical Study* (New York, n.d.).

²⁵"Wherever science and history have been associated, nothing but recognisable error and confusion has followed, and in logic such a contribution is impossible. The conjunction of science and history can produce nothing but a monster, for these are abstract and separate worlds of ideas, different and exclusive modifications of experience, which can only be joined at the cost of an *ignoratio elenchi*." Oakeshott, 168.

²⁶That is, (i) the single historical world has been split into two parts, the one determining, isolated from the temporal process, and working, not in that process, but on it; the other, which is determined, and supposed to be purely passive. (ii) The determining part is then elevated into a false particular, supposed to exist for and by itself, yet still thought of as determining the causes of particular events.

IV

In marking history off from natural science, we also mark it off from social science, *in so far* as this last itself confuses history and science,²⁷ and in so far as it models itself upon the rationalist science of the nineteenth century.

The point at which that kind of "scientism" comes most frequently, perhaps, into collision with history, is in its hankering for the "single cause."²⁸ As Oakeshott points out, explanation in terms of cause and effect is something of which the historian can make no use. For the scientist, the cause of an observed instance is the minimum condition which is required to bring that instance about: but if the historian tries to use "cause" in this sense, he must either limit cause to the immediate antecedent of an action, or expand it backwards in time in search of some absolute beginning. Nor will any of the single causes help him—a deity, economic cause, realization of human freedom, race, climate; they all involve either going outside history for the causes of historical events, or, as we have seen, abstracting one part of the historical world and making it the cause of what remains. "The only explanation of change relevant or possible in history," writes Oakeshott, "is simply a complete account of change. History accounts *for* change by means of a full account *of* change. The relation between events is always other events, and it is established in history by a full relation *of* the events. The conception of cause is thus replaced by the exhibition of a world of events intrinsically related to one another in which no *lacuna* is tolerated" (p. 143).

As we have seen, history pre-supposes a single world in which everything stands related to everything else, and "change in history carries with it its own explanation; the course of events is one, so far integrated, so far filled in and complete, that no external cause or reason is looked for or required in order to account for any particular event" (p. 141). It follows that explanation, for the historian, is to be sought, not in generalization,²⁹ but in more and greater detail. We are not very far from Stubbs and Maitland after all.³⁰

²⁷See Oakeshott's suggestive pages (219-33) on economics.

²⁸For example, of such phenomena as war. Cf. W. G. Sumner's remark that "social science is still in the stage that chemistry was in when people believed in a philosopher's stone. . . ." Quoted in H. J. Morgenthau, *Scientific Man vs Power Politics* (Chicago, 1946). This work is a study of the influence on social science of the rationalist assumption of a fundamental identity between physical nature and social life; physical nature being taken to be the rational, calculable universe of the older physics.

²⁹The historian does notice common characters, and does use empirical concepts to express them, so that he writes of "empires," "governing classes," etc. But, as De Burgh points out, his generalizations (as when he says that all English Labour Governments have had to reckon with the Trade Union Congress) are merely enumerative; they are not the universals which natural science establishes and which social science seeks. Further, such apparent universals as he uses ("Renaissance," "manorial system," etc.) do not really express the common character in a plurality of instances; they are patterns of events, each pattern being as unique as the events which constitute it.

³⁰One cannot have everything, and if the fact that Collingwood was himself a philosopher led him to draw attention to some of his fellows whom historians are apt to neglect, it also led him to treat cursorily the great post-classical historians, such as Maitland, who, nevertheless, in Collingwood's own words, "first mastered the objectively scientific critical methods of the great Germans, and learnt to study facts in all their detail with a proper apparatus of scholarship."

V

We have drawn attention to Collingwood's analysis of the nature of historical inquiry, "an analysis which puts to shame . . . all of the traditional handbooks from which graduate students are still being taught historiographical techniques."³¹ We have seen that the thesis which he was most anxious to contravert was the positivist teaching that history could be reduced to natural science. We may conclude this paper by noticing, briefly, the chief difficulties which his position may seem to raise—that of the objectivity of historical judgments, and that of the relation of history to a possible science of human nature.³²

Collingwood says that the business of the historian is to re-think the thoughts of persons long dead, a process whose difficulty he does not minimize, yet (for example, p. 262) he insists that historical inference can yield, not only probability, but demonstrable certainty.

He realized that there would be doubts as to whether these two positions are compatible with one another, and he devoted Section IV of his *Epilegomena* to the attempt to resolve such doubts. Therein, he argued that, although an act of thought cannot be repeated in its context of emotion, it can nevertheless be repeated. Emotion represents experience in its immediacy and cannot be revived; but thought, though it always occurs in a context of immediacy, is in its own nature mediate, and can be legitimately detached from its emotional background, and so re-thought.

We have seen that if we ask how the historian is able to re-think the thoughts of persons in the past, Collingwood replies that it is by the exercise of historical imagination, conceived not as arbitrary fancy, but as an *a priori* faculty.³³ We can admit that the perfect historian will appeal to a criterion which is *a priori* in the sense of being valid for others than himself, or even for other than his own generation, but the question still remains as to how it is possible for the actual historian to conform to this standard. For Collingwood, who saw so much as being historically-conditioned,³⁴ at times saw historical thinking as being itself historically-conditioned. "St. Augustine," he wrote, "looked at Roman history from the point of view of an early Christian; Tillemont, from that of a seventeenth-century Frenchman; Gibbon, from that of an eighteenth-century Englishman; Mommsen, from that of a nineteenth-century German. There is no

³¹M. Mandelbaum, in the *Journal of Philosophy*, Lancaster, Pa., XLIV, no. 7, Mar., 1947, 185.

³²We need not stay, I hope, to refute the usual Marxist objection to any theory which treats history as history of thought. Collingwood does not deny that men are influenced by the material conditions under which they live. The thought which the historian studies is thought embodied in action, and actions, on their "outside," take place in the physical world. But the influence which that world exerts on men's actions is neither *inevitable* nor *constant*, since men respond to the same external conditions in very different ways. The mistake of the historical materialist, in spite of his fondness for the *terminology* of dialectic, is to treat causal determination as though it were constant.

³³Since the actions which the historian studies are gone beyond possibility of observation, they have to be reached by inference, and a theory of historical knowledge must establish the rules, and legitimacy, of that inference.

³⁴In his earlier work, he appeared to say that religion embodied certain ultimate pre-suppositions of thought. In his later work, he treated these pre-suppositions as being themselves historically-conditioned. See F. H. Heinemann, "Reply to Historicism" (*Philosophy*, London, XXI, no. 80, Nov., 1946).

point in asking which was the right point of view. Each was the only one possible for the man who adopted it."³⁵

The significance of so complete a historicism appears when we consider what Collingwood held to be the *purpose* of history. That purpose, he says, is human self-knowledge. History exists to show man what he is by showing him what he has done: and, in this hey-day of social science, it is good to have history restored to the humanities; but does not the power of history to yield self-knowledge pre-suppose some common conception of human nature, and of the way in which human minds work? Or, to put the same point negatively, would not the view that all conceptions of human nature are entirely historically-relative, rule out that self-understanding which is history's purpose?

Now Collingwood denies that there can be any science of mind which transcends history, that there can be a science which generalizes about human nature from historical facts. He argues that patterns of behaviour only recur so long as minds of the same kind are placed in the same kind of situations, and that for such patterns to be constant, there must be a social order which recurrently produces situations of a certain kind. Such orders, however, are historical facts and subject to change, so that (says Collingwood) we can have no guarantee that a generalization about human nature will be valid for more than the historical period from which it is drawn. It follows that a science of human nature either resolves itself into history, or is claiming more than it can establish.

It will be seen that (if we are to take this in the form to which Collingwood appeared to commit himself) it would seem to deny the persistence of any "substance" of human nature which is common to more than one historical period; in which case, we might ask how the historian, who (on Collingwood's own showing) must re-enact the thought of the past, can find that past intelligible.³⁶ If my conception of human nature and Bolingbroke's conception of it are both *merely* the product of historical circumstances, how am I to understand Bolingbroke's thought (as Collingwood expects me to do) and use it to enrich my own?

It is true, as Collingwood insists, that the judgments of history are individual judgments, but it would still seem that, in making these, the historian assumes certain universal judgments (about human nature), and that, for these universal judgments, history supplies only a part of the material. To claim that history is all that we know of human nature, and all we need to know, seems to be to go too far; though we may agree that, if there be a science of human nature which is not history, we do not know its name. It is just possible that it is literature.

³⁵Collingwood, xii.

³⁶Collingwood attempts to meet this difficulty by distinguishing between natural process, in which the past dies in being replaced by the present, and historical process, in which the past, by being known, survives into the present.

LES ARTS AU CANADA SOUS LE RÉGIME FRANÇAIS

Par GÉRARD MORISSET
Musée de la Province de Québec

POUR peu qu'on étudie avec attention l'histoire des deux Amériques, on en arrive à faire une constatation générale, qui s'applique à chacun des pays du Nouveau Monde et jette une grande clarté sur la curieuse évolution des arts américains depuis trois siècles et plus. Cette constatation, la voici : aussi longtemps que les pays américains restent en contact étroit avec leurs mères-patries européennes, ils en constituent en quelque sorte une province lointaine ; ils vivent la même existence que dans leurs patries d'origine ; ils conservent les mêmes coutumes, la même langue, le même art de bâtir, le même style, bref la même civilisation—au sens large de ce terme. Cela est particulièrement vrai du Mexique, de la Floride, de la Nouvelle-Angleterre ; cela est encore plus vrai de l'ancienne Nouvelle-France.

Mais quand les pays américains, à la suite de conflits plus ou moins violents ou d'arrangements à l'amiable, se détachent de leurs mères-patries, ils évoluent pendant une certaine période au gré de leur génie propre ; ils tendent leurs forces vers le perfectionnement de leur civilisation ; en deux mots, ils cherchent à être eux-mêmes. Mais cette période ne dure guère ; car adviennent la vague de fond du romantisme et l'expansion de la grande industrie, c'est le ralentissement puis l'arrêt de leur civilisation, c'est leur appauvrissement esthétique, c'est la décadence puis l'affaïssement de leurs traditions artistiques. Alors, il ne leur reste plus que la ressource de se tourner vers l'Europe et de lui demander le secret de l'excellence de ses arts. C'est l'époque que nous sommes en train de vivre.

Au Canada, la Nouvelle-France est et reste une province française depuis sa fondation jusqu'à la capitulation de Montréal en 1760. Pendant des années, elle se développe normalement sur le modèle des deux provinces qui l'ont colonisée, la Normandie et la Bretagne. Vers les années mil sept cent trente - mil sept cent cinquante, c'est-à-dire à une époque de grande prospérité matérielle, elle commence à prendre les allures d'une personne majeure : elle cherche à créer les formes et le décor de son existence ; elle cherche, si je puis dire, un style de vie ; et déjà elle voit poindre la réussite. Mais la guerre de Sept Ans interrompt brusquement son labeur. Ce n'est qu'après le retour de la prospérité, vers les années 1780, qu'elle se forge enfin un style et qu'elle lui imprime son caractère. C'est l'âge d'or de nos arts domestiques. Hélas ! comme dans les autres pays d'Amérique, ce style commence à sombrer à l'avènement du romantisme et à l'invasion des produits industriels.

I

Si j'interroge les monuments domestiques qu'il nous reste du Régime français, je remarque d'abord que s'y fondent intimement deux tendances diverses de l'art français : d'une part, les proportions romanes, qui se sont longtemps conservées pures en France ; d'autre part, le décor et la mouluration du style Louis XIV. Telles sont les maisons *Villeneuve*

à Charlesbourg, *Routhier* et *Blais* à Sainte-Foy, *Richard* à Varennes. Mais dans la forme des maisons, il est une autre remarque qui s'impose à l'attention.

La maison montréalaise, courte, massive, profonde, flanquée de cheminées énormes et de coupe-feu, construite de gros cailloux noirs ou de ton rouille noyés dans un épais mortier blanc, semblant surgir de terre comme une forteresse domestique, nous vient directement de la Bretagne.

Au contraire, la maison québécoise, longue, peu profonde, enduite de mortier d'un ton ocre clair ou blanchie à la chaux, coiffée d'une haute toiture recouverte de bardeau, percée de fenêtres allongées à volets, souvent peinte en tons gais et chauds, est le type même de la maison normande, plus précisément de l'habitation accueillante de la Seine-Inférieure.

La première est d'une grandeur farouche. De l'autre se dégage une sorte de sérénité insouciant. Parfois, ces deux types, issus de la même origine romane et moulurés à la manière du Grand Siècle, se fondent en un compromis plein de charme; telles sont les imposantes habitations *Denis* à Neuville, *Cherrier* à Repentigny et *Chaput* à Varennes.

En architecture religieuse, deux types coexistent en Nouvelle-France dès la fin du XVII^e siècle. Le premier est l'antique église romane à transept, coiffée d'une haute toiture; à la façade, un clocher en charpente simplement mouluré. Il reste quelques exemples de ce type: l'église de *Saint-Pierre* (île d'Orléans), commencée en 1716, et la minuscule église du *Cap-de-la-Madeleine*, admirable de proportions et d'élan. Mais on en connaît plusieurs autres par la photographie ou la gravure: les anciennes églises de *Lachenaie*, des *Trois-Rivières*, de *Sainte-Anne-de-Beaupré*. . . Avec l'accroissement de la population, les églises nouvelles sont plus spacieuses; telles les églises de la *Sainte-Famille* (île d'Orléans) et du *Cap-Santé*, commencées respectivement en 1743 et en 1754; leur plan est à peu près le même qu'au Cap-de-la-Madeleine; mais leurs dimensions sont beaucoup plus considérables; à la façade, elles possèdent deux tours.

L'autre type d'église n'a pas la même ancienneté. C'est l'église à la *récollette*—suivant l'expression d'un évêque de Québec. Comme son nom l'indique, elle vient des Récollets: c'est un long rectangle sans transept, terminé par une abside plate ou par une sorte d'exèdre. L'exemple le plus ancien est la *chapelle de l'Hôpital-général*, commencée en 1670 par les Récollets; le chef-d'oeuvre du genre est assurément la *chapelle des Ursulines de Québec*, dont l'abside, sculptée vers 1735 par Noël Levasseur, présente l'aspect d'un arc de triomphe à l'antique. Dans la campagne, quelques petites églises ont été élevées suivant le même plan; telles les églises de *Saint-Jean* et de *Saint-François*, dans l'île d'Orléans; elles ont une abside arrondie. Après avoir fleuri pendant quelques années, le style à la *récollette* n'a survécu que dans l'un de ses éléments, le retable en arc de triomphe.

II

Après s'être abrités, eux et leurs bêtes, et après avoir construit leurs chapelles de bois ou leurs églises de pierre, les habitants de la Nouvelle-France songent à façonner des meubles domestiques et à orner leurs églises de sculpture. L'étude des meubles domestiques d'autrefois est

difficile à entreprendre à cause de la pénurie de documents. Mais nous sommes assez bien renseignés sur le décor sculptural des églises.

Pendant la première moitié du XVII^e siècle, presque tout mobilier religieux vient de France. Dès 1666, apparaissent à la cathédrale de Québec les premiers meubles sculptés au pays; ils sont l'oeuvre de Jean Lemelin; ces ouvrages ont disparu, ainsi que ceux de Jean Latour. Mais le temps et les hommes ont mieux respecté les ouvrages richement ornés de Jacques Leblond dit Latour; le *tabernacle* et le *retable de l'Ange-Gardien*, le *tabernacle de Sainte-Anne-de-Beaupré* (dans la chapelle commémorative) marquent le caractère vraiment classique de la sculpture de Leblond. En même temps que Leblond, Denys Mallet façonne de la sculpture pour la chapelle des Jésuites de Québec et pour des églises de Montréal; c'est du style Louis XIV somptueux et magnifique.

Si l'on songe que Leblond et Mallet ont été professeurs à l'École des Arts et Métiers de Saint-Joachim, entre les années 1690 et 1704, on conçoit que les sculpteurs de Québec aient mis en oeuvre le même style Louis XIV. Chez Noël Levasseur, le décor est discret et toujours élégant; à la sculpture ornementale se mêlent la statuaire, le bas-relief et la gravure au burin. Chez les fils Levasseur, François-Noël et Antoine, le style décoratif est plus abondant, plus luxueux. Chez Valin et Vézina, deux artisans québécois, la sculpture ornementale est forte, volontiers paysanne.

Tout autre est l'art sculptural d'un artisan des Trois-Rivières, Gilles Bolvin; originaire de la ville d'Avesnes, dans le nord de la France, il cultive chez nous une variante du style classique espagnol; les tabernacles de *Lachenaie* (1737) et de *Boucherville* (vers 1740) rappellent, par l'exubérance de leurs frises et l'extrême richesse de leurs rinceaux, les retables baroques de Tolède et de Séville.

Quant à l'École de sculpture de Montréal, on sait qu'elle est tard venue dans l'art canadien, qu'elle a brillé entre 1700 et 1740 grâce au talent de Charles Chaboillez, de Paul Jourdain dit Labrosse et de son frère; mais on sait aussi que les oeuvres de Chaboillez et des Jourdain ont péri presque toutes dans des sinistres, et qu'il n'en reste que de misérables épaves.

III

La peinture canadienne commence avec le fondateur de Québec, Samuel Champlain, il a dessiné les images qui ornent ses livres; à la fin de sa vie, il s'est essayé à la grande peinture; de son oeuvre, il reste les soixante-deux dessins à la plume, rehaussés de gouache, conservés à la bibliothèque John-Carter-Brown, à Providence. L'exemple de Champlain n'est pas perdu.

On peut dire que pendant tout le Régime français, il y a toujours, à Québec, aux Trois-Rivières ou à Montréal, un homme, laïc ou religieux, qui se livre à la peinture. Marie de l'Incarnation peint au moins un portrait, celui de la *Mère Saint-Joseph* (1650); l'abbé Hugues Pommier se spécialise dans les portraits de cadavres (*Marie de l'Incarnation* et *Catherine de Saint-Augustin*); le Frère Luc, le seul peintre de carrière de l'École canadienne du Régime français, brosse une trentaine de tableaux d'église et de portraits qui datent de 1670-1671 et qui existent

encore presque tous; l'abbé Guyon peint des portraits et lave des aquarelles qui servent à l'enseignement de la botanique au séminaire de Québec; Jacques Leblond, le sculpteur, ne dédaigne pas de se livrer parfois à la peinture d'église; des missionnaires, Pierron, Rasles, Chauchettièrre et Laure, ornent de leurs tableaux les chapelles de mission qu'ils desservent; Michel Dessailant, artiste qui ne se fixe nulle part, portraiture, de Québec à Détroit, les bourgeois et bourgeoises qui ont su faire fortune; des Sulpiciens, des Récollets et des Ursulines éprouvent leur talent, soit dans la peinture d'église soit dans la ressemblance des visages.

Et à mesure que s'écoulent les premières années du XVIII^e siècle, les artisans du pinceau deviennent si nombreux qu'il n'est pas facile de les départager; de plus, leurs qualités—car ils en possèdent—et leurs défauts sont à peu près les mêmes. On connaît assez bien les peintures de Pierre Le Ber—notamment le portrait post mortem de la *Mère Marguerite Bourgeoys* (1700). Mais que savons-nous de l'oeuvre de Paul Beaucour, vétérân mué en artiste? Que savons-nous de l'oeuvre du Frère François Brékenmacher, un émule récollet du Frère Luc? Que savons-nous des auteurs des nombreux portraits de l'époque 1720-1750, portraits fort abîmés assurément mais attachants par le solide réalisme de leur facture? Il y a là un champ ouvert à l'érudition. . .

Dans cette production considérable, il y a des toiles—notamment des portraits—qui sont assez bien conservées (par exemple, un admirable *portrait de fillette* conservé à l'Hôtel-Dieu de Québec). Avouons cependant que ces peintures sont, pour la plupart, sombres et enfumées; quelques-unes sont susceptibles d'être restaurées; mais les autres sont destinées à périr. Quoi qu'il en soit, elles témoignent, sinon du talent, du moins de la bonne volonté de ces artisans obscurs qui ne craignent point d'éprouver leurs forces dans un art difficile, dont l'improvisation est exclue.

IV

Si nos peintres du Régime français échouent à-demi dans leurs entreprises de portraits et de tableaux de dévotion, il n'en est pas ainsi de nos orfèvres. Dans cet art où la matière résiste aux bonnes intentions, l'apprentissage et le compagnonnage sont de rigueur: pour exercer l'orfèvrerie, pour marteler, souder et ciseler des feuilles d'or et d'argent, il faut connaître un certain nombre de secrets d'atelier et savoir les maîtriser d'une main sûre. Voilà pourquoi nos premiers orfèvres, s'ils retardent un peu sur nos autres artisans, font preuve d'une expérience et d'une virtuosité qui rappellent de près les qualités de l'orfèvrerie française de la plus belle époque.

Au reste, nombre d'orfèvres de cette époque sont d'origine française. C'est le cas de Jean Villain et de Michel Levasseur, d'Antoine Olivier dit Le Picard et de François Chambellan, de Jean-Baptiste Maisonbasse et de Roland Paradis, de Paul Lambert dit Saint-Paul et de Nicolas Gaudin dit La Poterie; et quelques-uns de ces artisans apportent en Nouvelle-France le style de Paris ou les particularités de leur province d'origine. Les autres sont nés dans la colonie; ils ont fait leur apprentissage chez des maîtres de Québec ou de Montréal; ils ont produit des oeuvres d'une technique savante et d'une grande plénitude de forme; en sorte qu'ils ont prolongé sur les bords du Saint-Laurent l'esprit et les formes de l'admirable argenterie du Grand Siècle.

L'un des plus illustres est Jacques Pagé dit Quercy, né à Québec en 1682; il a laissé des ouvrages—ciboires, plateaux et couverts de table—d'une grande virtuosité de facture. L'un des plus curieux est Michel Cotton, cordonnier qui, après un an d'apprentissage, se fait orfèvre; l'*ostensoir* qu'il a façonné vers 1730 pour l'église de la Sainte-Famille (île d'Orléans) se fait remarquer par l'élégance de son galbe et la fermeté de sa ciselure. Le plus archaïque d'entre eux est Roland Paradis; bien qu'il soit né à Paris, vers 1696, il a façonné des vases d'église dans un style voisin de celui de la jeunesse de Louis XIV. Enfin, le plus célèbre de nos orfèvres de l'époque est Paul Lambert dit Saint-Paul; né à Arras vers 1695, il arrive à Québec en 1729, y prend femme quelques mois après, s'établit à la Basse Ville, rue du Sault-au-Matelot, et y meurt en novembre 1749; telles de ses oeuvres—comme la *lampe* de la chapelle des Ursulines, l'*encensoir* de Saint-Pierre (île d'Orléans), ou le *ciboire* de Saint-Augustin—sont galbées avec tant de plénitude et ciselées avec tant de fantaisie qu'elles s'imposent par une sorte de perfection vivace et qu'elles font présager l'art dyssymétrique et désinvolte de notre plus grand orfèvre, François Ranvoyzé.

L'art de Paul Lambert ne meurt pas avec lui. Il se prolonge dans les rares oeuvres de l'apprenti du maître, Joseph Maillou; par sa perfection, il s'impose à un jeune orfèvre né à Lille en 1717, Ignace-François Delezenne, qui exerce d'abord son métier à Montréal et, en 1752, transporte son atelier à Québec; l'oeuvre de Delezenne, encore mal connue, comporte des pièces d'église d'une facture impeccable.

V

Que de choses à écrire sur les arts en Nouvelle-France avant le traité de Paris! Ils sont extraordinairement vivants. Ils sont parfois un peu gauches—car la technique est difficile et les outils sont rudimentaires; ils sont souvent simples—car ils sont faits pour des êtres peu compliqués; ils sont toujours adaptés à l'existence de cette poignée d'hommes laborieux qui, parce qu'ils vivent dans un pays façonné par la France, ont pleinement conscience qu'ils appartiennent à la grande communauté française et que la gloire de leur patrie repose en partie sur leurs épaules.

THE GROUP OF SEVEN IN CANADIAN HISTORY

By LAWREN HARRIS

Vancouver

It is an honour for me to address Canadian historians on an art movement in Canada—a movement which, I believe, has historical significance because it has affected both the outlook on art of Canadians generally and the development of art in Canada over the last thirty years.

Before beginning this brief and rather bald account of the Group of Seven, I feel that I should warn you that my story may differ somewhat from that of other members of the Group. I know, of course, that this is an all too familiar experience for those who have worked with source materials in the field of history. Hence the warning that my version is likely to be a fallible one. My memory for dates is almost non-existent and I am not always certain of the chronological sequence of events. I also look upon the Group of Seven as a movement in art in Canada and not in any sense as an organization. Accordingly, I have, in my story of the Group, included Tom Thomson as a working member, although the name of the Group did not originate until after Tom's death. Tom Thomson was, nevertheless, as vital to the movement, as much a part of its formation and development, as any other member. And now to the story of the Group of Seven.

The fact that today in Canada many phases of art are distinctively Canadian is one sign that we have commenced to create our own cultural background; it is also a sign that we have begun to find our own individuality and to make our contribution to the world's cultural communion. It is largely through the basic interplay between our vast land and the response it inspires in our hearts and minds that we shape our character and outlook as a people. Through the arts as an expressive and creative instrument we are able to bring our great environment into effective focus. This is at once a process of finding our emotional bearings in this immense country and a means of giving new form and meaning to our character.

The first task of our forefathers in this new land was altogether a pioneering one; clearing the wilderness, establishing settlements, making roads to connect one place with the next, organizing the settlements and cultivated areas into workable communities, and later forming all sections of the country into the semblance of a nation. The early settlers brought with them the manners and culture of the old lands from which they came. That great background of custom and tradition was almost their only comfort and spiritual security. It tided them over the strenuous period of settling in the new country. Not until we had built towns and cities and established ourselves firmly in the new land was there time or energy for the fine arts. Artistically, as in many other ways, we were a dependent people living in the gloom of a colonial attitude. We were a transplanted people whose roots had not yet commenced to draw spiritual nourishment from the new soil. Even after we had developed the beginnings of a political nation, established cultural centres, universities, colleges, music and art schools, the idea was generally held that anything we ourselves created in the arts was not worth serious consideration.

The European and Old Country outlook for a long period dominated cultural endeavour in Canada; its suitability to our creative needs as a

young and growing country was accepted without question. And yet the whole environment of the artist in Canada was different from the environment of the artist in England and in Europe. With few exceptions the English and the European artist was moved to create as much by the stimulus of masterpieces of art in the great galleries as by nature and mankind about him. A great heritage of tradition and aesthetic understanding was his. For the Canadian artist this type of stimulus did not exist. In Canada there were no great collections of old and modern masterpieces to study as a guide to creative adventure; and the art which was then accepted and valued by our wealthy patrons and connoisseurs—for there were such—was all of it imported but none of it notable: Dutch windmills, canals, and peasant house interiors, Barbizon left-overs, and tidy circumspect English pictures. Our middle-class homes were filled with engravings of Victorian battle scenes and such sentimentalities as prettified children playing blind man's buff or swinging in the garden. It was probably natural that Canadian painters previous to thirty or forty years ago, with a few notable exceptions, should look upon the Canadian scene through European eyes; it was probably natural that they should endeavour to impose their European ways of seeing and interpreting upon the Canadian country, and that they should try to find native scenes which fitted into the Barbizon, or Dutch, or English Royal Academy conception of landscape. No other way of painting this country was then seriously considered either by the painters or by the public. And yet these ways were totally inappropriate to the expression of the character, the power and clarity and rugged elemental beauty of their own land.

There were, however, a few painters who approached the Canadian scene in its own terms. In the province of Quebec there were Krieghoff, an early painter, and later James Morrice in a few of his Quebec paintings, Maurice Cullen, Suzor-Coté and Clarence Gagnon. In Ontario there were always a small number of paintings shown at the exhibitions of the Ontario Society of Artists which hinted at a possible Canadian statement. At the same time there was in Toronto an enthusiastic group of young commercial artists who were accustomed to go into the near by country sketching on week-ends and holidays. They, too, began, somewhat tentatively, to paint the country in its own terms. But these men were the exceptions. They commanded almost no attention. Our people for the most part clung to the imported cultural patterns of the Old World.

In 1910 an exhibition of Canadian painting was sent to England. An English critic wrote about the work of the Canadian artists: "At present the observation is strong, but the more immutable essence of each scene is crushed out by a foreign-begotten technique," which is to say, a foreign way of seeing. It was soon after this exhibition that a group of young Canadian painters came together drawn by an irresistible urge to replace this "foreign-begotten technique" by a way of painting dictated by Canada itself, to concentrate all their energy on making a Canadian statement in art in Canadian terms. To do so meant to put aside the ideas about art which were so widely accepted by our people and which were sanctioned by most artists themselves. It meant that these young painters would be obliged to free themselves from every influence which might come between them and Canada as a new world

for creative adventure in art. This, broadly speaking, was the motive force behind the Group of Seven. /

Canada was then, as it still remains, a long, thin strip of civilization on the southern fringe of a vast expanse of immensely varied, virgin land reaching into the remote north. Our whole country is cleansed by the pristine and replenishing air which sweeps out of that great hinterland. / It was the discovery of this great northern area as a field of art which enticed and inspired these painters. / This discovery was gradual as was the development of the painters themselves. From the streets in the older parts of the city to its outer edge, where it met the countryside, and beyond into the rural districts and finally into the great north they went, each new discovery bringing with it new creative convictions. With these new convictions and the pure joy of finding the expressive possibilities of new regions, the power of their painting grew in strength and in its Canadian quality. They began to realize how far this country of Canada was different in character, atmosphere, moods, and spirit from Europe and the old land. It was a country which evoked a response free from all preconceived ideas and rule-of-thumb reactions. It had to be seen, lived with, and painted with complete devotion to its own character, life, and spirit, before it yielded its secrets. For only great devotion can achieve real insight and arrive at a full meaning.

All this was something completely new to Canadians. It was something which the vast majority of our people, most if not all of our art lovers and critics, simply did not understand. Art to them was no more than a decoration, a pleasant distraction, a social cachet, not a way of life. Too often they confused mere prettiness with real beauty. They did not know their own country. They did not know its spirit as a transforming power. They did not think of the arts as a living, creative force in the life of a people. They had no other idea than that of accepting the crumbs from the richly laden table of European art and culture.

Nevertheless a native art movement had come into being, an art movement which had its source, growth and life in a direct, first-hand, and continuous experience of a native scene unknown to most Canadians except as geographical names. / And the men of this movement, the Canadian painters, explored the whole land: Georgian Bay, Algonquin Park, the Laurentians, Northern Ontario, the north and south shores of the Gulf of St. Lawrence, Algoma, the north shore of Lake Superior, the Nova Scotian coast, the Rocky Mountains, and the Canadian Arctic from Labrador to Kane Basin. /

In order that you may be able better to understand the formation of the Group of Seven, its activity and development, I feel that I should give you a brief personal account of events as I remember them.

A few moments ago I referred to a group of artists working in a commercial art firm, who devoted their week-ends and holidays to sketching in the country near Toronto. Four of these artists became members of the Group of Seven. They were J. E. H. MacDonald, Arthur Lismer, Franz Johnson, and F. H. Varley. Later on Frank Carmichael and A. J. Casson joined the Group. Tom Thomson was, as I mentioned at the outset, part of the movement before we pinned a label on it.

I first met MacDonald at the old Arts and Letters Club in Toronto thirty-eight years ago. There was an exhibition of his sketches on the

walls of the club; sketches of scenes painted in the vicinity of his home which was on the outskirts of the city. These sketches contained intimations of something new in painting in Canada, an indefinable spirit which seemed to express the country more clearly than any painting I had yet seen. I was deeply moved. Here, it seemed to me, was the beginning of what I, myself, vaguely felt; what I was groping toward—Canada painted in her own spirit.' These sketches of MacDonald's affected me more than any painting I had ever seen in Europe. MacDonald and I became close friends.

The two of us discussed the possibility of an art expression which should embody the moods and character and spirit of the country. We learned that there was an exhibition of modern Scandinavian paintings at the Albright Art Gallery in Buffalo and decided that we should go there to see it. This turned out to be one of the most stimulating and rewarding experiences either of us had had. Here were a large number of paintings which gave body to our rather nebulous ideas. Here were paintings of northern lands created in the spirit of those lands. Here was a landscape as seen through the eyes, felt in the hearts, and understood by the minds of people who knew and loved it. Here was an art, bold, vigorous, and uncompromising, embodying direct experience of the great north.

As a result of this experience in Buffalo our enthusiasm increased. Our purpose became clarified and our conviction reinforced. From that time on we knew that we were at the beginning of an all-engrossing adventure. That adventure, as it turned out, was to include the exploration of the whole country for its expressive and creative possibilities in painting. We first went to the Haliburton country, then to the upper Ottawa River and the Laurentians north of Montreal, coming in contact for the first time with that indefinable spirit of the North.

In 1910 at an exhibition of the Ontario Society of Artists we saw a painting entitled "The Edge of the Maple Wood." It stood out from all the other paintings as an authentic, new expression. It was clear, fresh, and full of light, luminous with the sunlight of early Canadian spring. If any of you were to see it today you might find it quite serene. Nevertheless that painting is significant because it marked the first time that any Canadian painting had contained such startling verity.

This painting was the work of A. Y. Jackson, a Montreal artist. None of us in Toronto had heard of him before. At once I wrote to Jackson a long screed full of enthusiasm, enlarging on the possibilities of painting the Canadian scene as no one yet had painted it except himself in "The Edge of the Maple Wood." Jackson replied to my letter with an enthusiasm equal to my own. In it he told me that he was going to Berlin, Ontario (now called Kitchener), to visit an aunt and asked me if I would go there and have a talk with him. I did so. I told him that we had plans for a studio building in Toronto, the first of its kind in Canada and invited him to join us and occupy one of the studios. He said he would do so and later he did. The Studio Building has been his home ever since.

Before Jackson came to Toronto we carried on a lively correspondence. I quote from one of his letters:

Yes, I am quite in accord with you. You have only to look over the catalogues of our exhibitions and you see trails crawling all over Europe, 'Spring in Belgium,' 'Summer

in Versailles,' 'Autumn in the Riviera.' Ye Gods, imagine Monet pottering around Jamaica, Pissaro hard at it in Japan, Renoir out in the Rockies, Sisley in Sicily—and the French Impressionists would never have existed.

The Studio Building was completed in 1914. MacDonald, Jackson and I had studios in it. We tried to induce Tom Thomson to join us. Thomson loved the north. The north country and painting were his life. He lived through the winter in town with the sole idea of making enough money so that he could go north as soon as the ice broke in the rivers and lakes. Tom did not want a studio in the building. It was altogether too pretentious for him. He would not feel at home in it. There was a dilapidated old shack on the back of the property which was built in the days when that part of Toronto was the town of Yorkville. We fixed it up, put down a new floor, made the roof watertight, built in a studio window, put in a stove and electric light. Tom made himself a bunk, shelves, a table, and an easel, and lived in that place as he would in a cabin in the north. It became Tom's shack and was his home until he died in 1917. It has been known as "Tom's shack" ever since.

We had commenced our great adventure. We lived in a continuous blaze of enthusiasm. We were at times very serious and concerned, at other times hilarious and carefree. Above all we loved this country and loved exploring and painting it. Emerson once wrote "Every great and commanding movement in the annals of the world is the triumph of enthusiasm." Please do not think that we had any idea of leading a great and commanding movement; but we did have enthusiasm. We began to range the country and each one of us painted hundreds of sketches. The love of the country and our irrepressible ardour commenced to infuse something new into our work.

Thomson began to develop. His work commenced to emerge into the clear Canadian daylight. His painting had been tight and sombre, almost a gray monotone in colour. Jackson's sparkling, vibrant, rich colour opened his eyes, as it did the eyes of the rest of us, and Tom saw the Canadian landscape as he had never seen it before. It amounted to a revelation. And from then on nothing could hold him.

I should explain that there were, at this time, no exhibitions of modern painting in Canada. No exhibitions came from Europe, save occasional shows of third-rate old masters and various kinds of dealers' wares, and nothing at all came from the United States. Thus, in everything to do with art we were entirely dependent on ourselves. We had to generate within ourselves everything which made for the development of our work. So we continuously derived inspiration and encouragement from one another.

Thomson knew the north country as none of us did and it was he who made us partners in his devotion to it. His last summer saw him produce his finest work. He was just moving into the full tide of his power when he was lost to us. Tom was an adept woodsman and canoeman. He was at the same time sensitive and given to occasional fits of despondency. He would often sit in the twilight, leaning over from his chair, facing his painting, after working at high pitch all day, and flick bits of broken wooden matches on the thick wet paint where they stuck. He had a poor opinion of his own work but an exaggeratedly good opinion of the work of the rest of us. Because of his lovable nature and unusual character, he attracted visitors, and we had perforce to protect him from them;

for if they expressed admiration for one of his sketches Tom would immediately give it away. We appreciated the value of Tom's work even if he did not. Tom was tall, lithe, and very graceful. He was also a real craftsman. He made trolls for fishing out of piano wire; sometimes he made beads and hammered out pieces of metal which were works of art in themselves.

Dr. James MacCallum, then a leading oculist in Toronto, was a partner in the Studio Building venture. He, too, was an expert woodsman and canoeman and a man of the north in his summer holidays. Not only did he share our enthusiasm; he contributed something to it. Over a period of years he invited Jackson, MacDonald, Lismer, and Varley to his summer home near Go-Home-Bay on Georgian Bay, to paint. Dr. MacCallum helped support Thomson by purchasing his sketches and paintings and ended up by owning the largest collection of Thomson's work in the country. He died nine years ago and left his collection to the National Gallery of Canada.

MacCallum always paid Tom in cash for his paintings except on one occasion when he gave Tom a cheque. This cheque was on the Bloor and Yonge Street branch of the Bank of Commerce and Tom betook himself there to cash it. The teller told him he would have to be identified. This was something new in Tom's life. He had always been trusted in his beloved north country and this appeared to him as an insult. He left the bank in disgust and walked down Yonge Street to the next branch of the bank at College Street and once again was told that he would have to be identified. In both disgust and anger this time he tore up the cheque, told all and sundry to go to hell, and walked out. Months later he told us the story as an illustration of city ways. We informed the doctor and Tom received payment in cash then and on all future occasions.

When he was in Toronto Tom rarely left the shack in the daytime, and then only when it was absolutely necessary. He took his exercise at night. He would put on his snowshoes and tramp the length of the Rosedale ravine and out into the country and return before dawn. In the north on fine nights he would sleep in the bottom of his canoe. He would push it out into whatever lake he was on, crawl under the thwarts, roll himself in his blanket and go to sleep.

I remember one afternoon in early spring on the shore of one of the Cauchon lakes in Algonquin Park when a dramatic thunderstorm came up. There was a wild rush of wind across the lake and all nature was tossed into a turmoil. Tom and I were in an abandoned lumber shack. When the storm broke Tom looked out, grabbed his sketch box, ran out into the gale, squatted behind a big stump and commenced to paint in a fury. He was one with the storm's fury, save that his activity, while keyed to a high pitch, was nonetheless controlled. In twenty minutes Tom had caught in living paint the power and drama of storm in the north. Here was symbolized, it came to me, the function of the artist in life: he must accept in deep singleness of purpose the manifestations of life in man and in great nature and transform these into controlled and ordered and vital expressions of meaning.

The war of 1914-18 dispersed us. MacDonald, Lismer, Varley, and Johnson were too much occupied to give much time to painting. Jackson was wounded in France. During the third year of the war I was dis-

charged from the army as medically unfit and devoted over a year to regaining my health. Dr. MacCallum and I went on an exploration trip to Manitoulin Island in northern Lake Huron, but finding it offered little for the painter, we went to Sault Ste Marie and from there up the ramshackle Algoma Central Railway to a lumber camp at mile 129. We found Algoma a rugged, wild land packed with an amazing variety of subjects. It was a veritable paradise for the creative adventurer in paint in the Canadian North.

After the war, for four successive years for a month in the autumn, we explored and painted Algoma. The Algoma Central converted an old box-car into suitable living quarters, put in a few windows, four bunks, a stove, water tanks, sink, cupboard, two benches, and a table. We carried a one-man handcar inside for use up and down the tracks—two of us could manage to ride on it—and a canoe for use on the lakes and rivers. A freight train would haul us up the line, and leave the box-car on a siding at Batchewana or in the Algoma Canyon for a week or ten days. Then, on instructions, another freight would pick us up and haul us to another siding.

We worked from early morning until dark in sun, grey weather or in rain. In the evening by lamp or candlelight each showed the others his sketches. This was a time for criticism, encouragement, and discussion, for accounts of our discoveries about painting, for our thoughts about the character of the country, and our descriptions of effects in nature which differed in each section of the country. We found, for instance, that there was a wild richness and clarity of colour in the Algoma woods which made the colour in southern Ontario seem grey and subdued. We found that there were cloud formations and rhythms peculiar to different parts of the country and to different seasons of the year. We found that, at times, there were skies over the great Lake Superior which, in their singing expansiveness and sublimity, existed nowhere else in Canada. We found that one lake would be friendly, another charming and fairy-like, the next one remote in spirit beyond anything we had known, and again the next one harsh and inimical. Later on, in the Rockies, we discovered that mountains vary markedly in character and mood. And we found that all these differences in character, mood, and spirit were vital to a creative expression in paint which went beyond mere decoration and respectability in art.

It was in Algoma that J. E. H. MacDonald did his best work. Such well-known paintings as "The Solemn Land," "Mist Fantasy" and "The Beaver Dam" resulted from these Algoma trips. One of the finest of Jackson's large canvases, entitled "Wartz Lake, Algoma," also resulted from the Algoma experience, as did Arthur Lismer's "Isles of Spruce." Both of these paintings now hang in the Hart House collection at the University of Toronto.

The last two seasons in Algoma we lived in log cabins, and during the last few weeks of all, at Sand Lake further north where the country begins to flatten out. Lismer had to return to take up his work at the Ontario College of Art, and Jackson and I went on to the north shore of Lake Superior.

There, once again, we found new and inspiring subjects, both in the hills along the shores of the great lake and inland in the high country with its rugged scenery, rocky streams, and innumerable lakes. In the

autumn of each of the next four years we camped on or near the shores of Lake Superior from Heron Bay to Rossport, and usually remained there until the end of October. On one occasion we were frozen out, though we did learn to live quite comfortably in a tent at temperatures below freezing. Lismer came with us on one of these sketching trips, Frank Carmichael on two of them, and Casson on the last one.

During these years Jackson spent a month or more toward the end of each winter in his beloved Quebec villages, La Malbaie, Baie St. Paul, Les Eboulements, St. Hilarion and Ste Tite des Caps, or on the south shore of the Gulf of St. Lawrence. Others of us went into the northern Ontario woods in winter and, despite the fact that outdoor sketching was difficult at low temperatures, we managed to collect a fair amount of material.

After the Lake Superior trips Jackson and I went to the Rocky Mountains where we lived with the park rangers in their log cabins in Jasper Park. Sometimes we camped in order to sketch in more remote mountain country. We first spent ten days with an iron-haired, taciturn ranger named Goodair, whose cabin was high up in the Tonquin valley. We became good friends and corresponded until he was killed by a grizzly bear one evening outside that same cabin. In September of the same summer we made a camp high up on the east side of Maligne Lake. We had spent a week there a month earlier and had then blazed a trail to this site. We started early in the morning to tote our bed rolls, small tent, sketching material, and food for ten days up to this spot. The going was tough and so it was not until late that same evening that we were settled. We pitched the tent just above the timber line on sloping ground, there being no level location. I built up a pile of crossed sticks under the foot of my bed roll so that it was level. Jackson did not bother to do the same; he simply crawled into his bed roll and went to sleep. Next morning at sunrise I awoke and glanced over to where Jackson was when last I saw him. He was not there; neither was his bed roll. There was no sign of him. I looked out of the tent flap and there he was twenty feet below, pulled up against a rock, buried in his bed roll, still fast asleep.

After this expedition, and the Lake Superior painting trips, each one of us went to different parts of the country. Jackson continued to go to the Quebec villages, to Nova Scotia, and to Georgian Bay. Lismer went to the MacGregor Bay country of Georgian Bay. Carmichael built himself a cabin by one of the lakes in the La Cloche mountains and Casson went to the northern Ontario villages on his holidays. MacDonald spent a month of each summer at Lake O'Hara in the Rocky Mountains and painted a large number of sketches there from which he developed some outstanding canvases.

One summer Jackson went on the Canadian Government expedition to the Arctic with Dr. Banting, who later became Sir Frederick Banting. Banting was infatuated with the Canadian north and became deeply concerned about its interpretation in art. Eventually he became a great admirer of the work of the Group. I say he became an admirer, because when he first saw the paintings he was greatly puzzled. Like most other Canadians he had been conditioned by a way of seeing which was "foreign-begotten." But he was intrigued, visited us in our studios, and became

so engrossed with the work of the Group that he took up painting himself and accompanied Jackson on several sketching trips.

A few years after Jackson's and Banting's trip to the Arctic, Jackson and I joined the Government Arctic expedition. We were most fortunate on this occasion as this particular expedition made the most extensive trip ever taken in the Arctic region in one season. The ship went directly north to Godhaven on the Greenland coast, and then up the coast to Etah where Commander Peary used to winter, and then into Kane Basin. From this point we went south along the coast of Ellesmere Island into Lancaster Sound where we were held up by ice for days. For four hours on our way out the ship was in danger of being crushed by the immense weight of the huge moving ice-floes. We then went around the top of Baffin's Island, down the east coast to Hudson's Straits, through the straits and across the northern waters of Hudson Bay to Chesterfield Inlet. Later we returned through the straits and proceeded southward along the Labrador coast to Nova Scotia.

While we were on this trip Jackson and I painted a large number of sketches, although painting was difficult as we usually saw the most exciting subjects while steaming through channels or while being bumped by pack ice. On many occasions we had time only to take rapid notes. These notes we worked up into sketches, crowded in our small cabin, seated on the edge of our respective bunks with only a port-hole to let in the light.

On all of our camping and sketching trips we learned to explore each region for those particular areas where form and character and spirit reached its summation. We became increasingly conscious of the fact that the spirit of the land must be discovered through its own character if there is to be any real life in its art. We came to know that it is only through the deep and vital experience of its total environment that a people identifies itself with its land and gradually a deep and satisfying awareness develops. We were convinced that no virile people could remain subservient to, and dependent upon the creations in art of other peoples in other times or places. /

Through our own creative experience we came to know that the real tradition in art is not housed only in museums and art galleries and in great works of art; it is innate in us and can be galvanized into activity by the power of creative endeavour in our own day, and in our own country, by our own creative individuals in the arts. We also came to realize that we in Canada cannot truly understand the great cultures of the past and of other peoples until we ourselves commence our own creative life in the arts. Until we do so we are looking at these from the outside. When, however, we begin to adjust and focus our own seeing through our own creative activity and conviction we are working from the inside, with the creative spirit itself; then the arts of the past and of other peoples become immediate, alive, and luminous to us.

This way of working with the creative spirit in our own day and place is, of course, the same which has created all the great works of the past. It is the means by which a people finds its soul and it creates the condition in which the soul may unfold. / So it was that the creative life and work of the Group of Seven resulted from a love of the land. From the cities, towns, and countrysides to the far reaches of the northern ice-fields it was an ever clearer and deeply moving experience of oneness with the

spirit of the whole land. It was this spirit which dictated, guided, and instructed us how the land should be painted. To us there was also the strange brooding sense of another nature fostering a new race and a new age.

The Group of Seven never had any organization. It had no officers and no leader, although three or four of us have been accused of this at various times. We held an exhibition each year in the Toronto Art Gallery. Each exhibition was for us a very stirring event. It marked the culmination of the year's work, and gave us the opportunity of seeing a large number of our paintings together and appraising the force and total impact of the work. Moreover, we could, each one of us, learn his own lesson by seeing his work hung with that of the others. Both the Toronto Art Gallery, where we held nearly all of our exhibitions, and the National Gallery, which purchased many of our paintings, were a source of valued encouragement.

The effect of these new paintings upon the Canadian public and press was startling. That a real art movement inspired by the country itself should be taking place in Canada was more than the critics and public could credit. The painters and their works were attacked from all sides. Whole pages in the newspapers and periodicals were devoted to it. Such a display of anger, outrage, and cheap wit had never occurred in Canada before. The paintings were compared in the press to "a Hungarian goulash," "a drunkard's stomach," "a head cheese" and so on. Here are two short excerpts from the press.

Nobody visiting the exhibition is likely to miss having his or her sense of colour, composition, proportion and good taste violently affronted by these canvases—all tinged with the same blustering spirit of post impressionism—all conveying the same impression, that the artist was out to make a sensation, did not know how to do it and wasted considerable good pigment in a disastrous attempt.

The second quotation is a press comment made when a number of the Group paintings were exhibited in the west:

Even the unsophisticated west could see that it had got a nasty blow in its untutored eye, when asked to look at the monstrosities purveyed by the group of seven.

We were told, quite seriously, that there never would be a Canadian art because we had no art tradition. And when we wanted to know how an art tradition had been created in any place, in any age, there was no answer. And so it went. It was all grist to the creative mill. It was all very exciting and enormous fun, for it was, to us, a sign that new life was actually stirring in the bones of art in Canada.

I should explain that there was at that time no professional newspaper or periodical writer who knew anything about art, who had any understanding of the meaning of art throughout the ages, or of the significance of contemporary art movements in the world at large. There were, however, a few laymen who knew the country and who had a feeling for the great northern hinterland; they were the first to respond to the work of the Group because to them it was the first satisfying expression of the country they loved. One or two of these men wrote in enthusiastic terms about the work of the Group, and a steadily growing number of people came to appreciate that the new paintings meant something vital to the country. This feeling of appreciation grew and spread, in part because the artists were not concerned with art move-

ments as such but with interpreting the country to the people. The whole endeavour functioned as an interplay between the artists and the country. The way in which the sketches and paintings were made, the way the artists explored, camped, and lived, were strictly in the spirit of the country and its people. It was because the work of the Group not only possessed the quality of merit but was so closely identifiable with the spirit of Canada that the vilification of the critics went for nothing.

During the last years of the Group three exhibitions of Canadian paintings were sent to England. These exhibitions included many paintings by members of the Group and its co-workers. These paintings were acclaimed by *The Times*, *The Morning Post*, *The Saturday Review*, and many other English periodicals. In contrast with the comments about "foreign-begotten techniques" of an earlier period, the critics now wrote "Canada can boast a real National School of Art that owes little or nothing to European influence." Another critic wrote, "the paintings were the most vital group of paintings produced since the war—indeed in this century." Another wrote, "Canada has arrived, she has a national style, however young, and the time is not far distant when we shall purchase Canadian paintings for our National and provincial collections." This prediction was realized shortly afterwards. The Tate Gallery trustees chose five Canadian paintings from which to select one to be purchased for the national collection. Four of these were painted by members of the Group of Seven. The one finally chosen was painted by A. Y. Jackson and it now hangs in the Tate Gallery.

In the later exhibitions of the Group we invited other artists to exhibit their works with ours. These artists had been influenced by the Group, but, although all painted in a similar spirit, each made his or her own individual contribution to the growing movement as it spread across the country. New members of the Group included L. L. Fitzgerald of Winnipeg and Edwin Holgate of Montreal. Emily Carr was one of the first invited contributors, and the attention her work received from the artists of the Group induced her to go east and visit them. It was this experience which inspired her to start painting once again, and then followed the best painting period of her career.

Eventually it became desirable to enlarge the Group, and in 1930 the old name was dropped and a new art society, called the Canadian Group of Painters, was organized. The new society has some thirty-five active members living and painting in various parts of Canada.

To sum up in a few words the contribution of the Group of Seven to Canadian history, I may say that the effect of our work was to free artists all over Canada, to make it possible for them to see and paint the Canadian scene in its own terms and in their own way. Today we have what we did not have forty years ago: we have the beginnings of a creative tradition in art engendered by the country itself; we have the beginnings of an art expression which is as much a part of Canadian life as the grain elevator, the maple leaf, and the west wind.

CENT ANS DE GOUVERNEMENT À LA RIVIÈRE ROUGE

Par M. l'abbé ANTOINE D'ESCHAMBAULT

L'HISTOIRE juridique de l'Ouest canadien, et de la Rivière Rouge ou Terre de Rupert (Rupert's Land), offre un terrain varié et peu exploré. Si l'on connaît de mieux en mieux la série des événements qui se sont déroulés à l'ouest et au nord du Lac Supérieur, et si l'on en saisit mieux aujourd'hui les motifs et les causes, il reste vrai qu'on en connaît encore imparfaitement les aspects légaux et juridiques. Les raisons de cette ignorance sont multiples.

Disons tout d'abord que la Compagnie de la Baie d'Hudson, qui joua un rôle si important dans l'histoire de l'Ouest canadien, fut avant tout une entreprise commerciale et qu'elle envisagea forcément les choses et les individus à la lumière de ses intérêts particuliers. Son premier soin fut de payer des dividendes à ses actionnaires; les autres formes d'activité—civilisation, industrie, gouvernement, colonisation—lui furent imposées et ne furent acceptées que par surcroît et en raison de son monopole commercial. Il nous entraînerait sans doute trop loin de montrer qu'on avait déjà en Angleterre l'expérience de ces sortes de compagnies à but commercial et à rayonnement social et politique, comme le prouve David Hannay dans son travail sur les compagnies à chartes (the Great Chartered Companies). Ces compagnies servaient d'avant-garde à une avance mieux organisée et plus méthodique et elles établissaient une situation de fait qui pouvait ou allait devenir une situation de droit. Tout cela serait demeuré vrai dans le cas de la Compagnie de la Baie d'Hudson, tout comme ce fut le cas pour les Compagnies des Indes, sans excepter la colonie de Lord Selkirk. A cause de cette particularité il y eut dans l'Ouest canadien, à un certain temps, trois gouvernements distincts: celui de la Terre de Rupert; celui des territoires en dehors de cette région; celui des régions de la Colombie Britannique qui ressembla aux gouvernements des colonies de la Couronne Britannique.

Immédiatement après la conquête ou la cession du Canada, la Compagnie de la Baie d'Hudson voulut faire reconnaître ses droits de premier occupant et les privilèges conférés par sa Charte de 1670. Mais les traiteurs de Montréal et des colonies anglaises ne se préoccupèrent pas des prétentions de la vieille compagnie et envahirent immédiatement les territoires de commerce des Français. Ce fut la raison du soulèvement des Indiens, sous l'habile direction du grand Pontiac. Le gouvernement de Londres dut intervenir et essaya de régler la traite, tout en excluant les traiteurs canadiens des territoires de la Compagnie de la Baie d'Hudson. En juillet 1764, on émit de Londres une série de règlements en vertu desquels la traite en pays sauvage devait se faire sous la surveillance d'agents et de surintendants locaux, qui seraient nommés selon les besoins. Comme personne ne s'occupait de ces règlements et qu'on ne pouvait les faire observer, il fallut autre chose! En 1768 il fut décidé de remettre la chose entre les mains du Gouverneur de Québec. Celui-ci devait émettre les permis requis pour pénétrer à l'intérieur. Il en fut ainsi jusqu'à 1774 et l'Acte de Québec, qui rat-

tachait à la juridiction du Gouverneur, une partie des territoires de l'ouest jusqu'au Mississippi, et de là au nord, jusqu'aux territoires réclamés par la Compagnie de la Baie d'Hudson. Il finit ainsi par s'établir une jurisprudence, en vertu de laquelle le gouvernement du Canada avait autorité sur les territoires autres que les terres arrosées par les affluents de la Baie d'Hudson. Ainsi lorsque Lamothe, employé de la Compagnie de la Baie d'Hudson, tua un employé de la Compagnie du Nord-Ouest qui l'avait attaqué, on se demanda qui devait le juger. Richardson, un des bourgeois de la Compagnie du Nord-Ouest, était d'opinion que Lamothe devait être jugé à Kaministiquia. Par ailleurs le juge-en-chef Allock opinait qu'il fallait faire conduire l'accusé en Canada "pourvu que le crime ait été commis, disait-il, dans une partie du territoire britannique, en dehors des lieux compris sous la Charte à la Baie d'Hudson." Richardson donna son avis que le meurtre avait été commis dans le territoire de la Baie d'Hudson. Lamothe fut conduit à Montréal mais quand il apprit qu'il lui faudrait languir en prison en attendant que l'on décidât de l'endroit et de la juridiction de la cour, il s'enfuit dans les pays d'en haut. Nous citons ce cas pour montrer combien il fut difficile de fixer les responsabilités de chacune des sections juridiques du pays de l'Ouest canadien.

En 1803, au sein de la lutte entre la Compagnie du Nord-Ouest et celle de la Baie d'Hudson, le Parlement britannique passa le "Canada Jurisdiction Act" en vertu duquel toute infraction commise dans les territoires en dehors des deux provinces du Haut et Bas-Canada et en dehors des régions où la compagnie de la Baie d'Hudson exerçait son influence, serait jugée selon les lois prévalant dans les deux vieilles provinces. En même temps on donnait au Gouverneur du Bas-Canada pouvoir de nommer des magistrats et juges de paix pour entendre les plaintes et en décider, ou encore de faire appréhender les coupables et les faire conduire aux cours du Bas-Canada. De fait les seuls juges et magistrats qui furent alors nommés, furent précisément les magnats de la Compagnie du Nord-Ouest et on comprend facilement dans quel esprit ils administrèrent la justice!

Lorsque Lord Selkirk fit l'acquisition des quarante-cinq millions d'âcres destinés à sa future colonie, il s'enquit auprès des légistes britanniques de la validité de la Charte de Charles II, au Prince Rupert. On lui répondit que le droit de la Compagnie de la Baie d'Hudson au sol semblait indiscutable, et que par conséquent l'octroi qui pourrait être fait à Selkirk était légalement valable. En plus les juristes anglais opinaient que le privilège d'administration civile et criminelle déjà assuré par la Charte au sein des territoires de la Baie d'Hudson, devait appartenir également à la colonie. On établissait encore ici la distinction entre les territoires de la Baie d'Hudson et les autres parties du Nord-Ouest. D'après la Charte, disait-on, le Gouverneur de tout établissement sur le territoire de la Baie d'Hudson, avec son Conseil, pouvait juger de toute cause, au civil comme au criminel, et punir toute infraction, selon la lettre et l'esprit des lois d'Angleterre.

En 1821 eut lieu la fusion des deux grandes compagnies, celle de la Baie d'Hudson et celle du Nord-Ouest. L'événement mit fin au litige violent qui avait fait couler du sang et menacé de ruine la colonie de Lord Selkirk. En juillet 1821 le Parlement britannique passa un Acte

pour "régler la traite de fourrures et établir une juridiction civile et criminelle dans certaines parties de l'Amérique du Nord." Il s'agissait—l'Acte le spécifiait encore une fois—de traite avec les sauvages dans les endroits soustraits, à la juridiction de la Compagnie de la Baie d'Hudson. On voulait donc perpétuer le système légal qui avait eu cours auparavant et le solidifier par un Acte nouveau. Les pouvoirs de la Compagnie de la Baie d'Hudson en furent affermis, ainsi que la juridiction du gouvernement canadien.

Durant le cours de la même année (1821) Lord Bathurst, au nom du gouvernement britannique donna à la nouvelle compagnie, le privilège de traite exclusive et enjoignit au Gouverneur et à quelques officiers de voir à l'administration des litiges dépassant 200 livres. L'année suivante, la Compagnie de la Baie d'Hudson avertissait ses "chief factors" de faire la traite avec les Indiens mais leur enjoignait d'avertir tous les autres traiteurs ou "hommes libres" qu'ils n'avaient aucun droit et qu'on pouvait se saisir des fourrures qu'ils pourraient avoir en leur possession. Il s'agit toujours des territoires situés en dehors de ceux prévus par la Charte de 1670!

Pour ce qui est des territoires de la Compagnie même, on se demanda s'il fallait faire une différence entre les terres de la colonie de Selkirk et les autres propriétés de la Compagnie. Lord Bathurst approuva le plan soumis par les officiers de la Compagnie à Londres à l'effet qu'il devait y avoir, pour tout le pays, deux Gouverneurs assistés de leurs Conseils respectifs et en plus qu'il y aurait pour la colonie d'Assiniboia ou de Selkirk un Gouverneur muni des mêmes pouvoirs. L'autorité de ce dernier resterait suspendue lorsque l'un des deux Gouverneurs serait présent et choisirait d'exercer la justice. On devait aussi nommer un shérif pour le district d'Assiniboia et deux autres pour les territoires de la Compagnie de la Baie d'Hudson. Le système laissait une certaine marge aux officiers des diverses régions qui, en pratique, devaient interpréter la loi selon leurs vues. Ainsi John Clarke, facteur-en-chef au Fort Garry, prétendit plus tard que les colons n'avaient pas le droit de faire du commerce avec les Indiens, même s'il s'agissait de l'achat de marchandises jugées nécessaires, comme le pemmican ou tout autre article. Clarke fut reprimandé mais le monopole de la Compagnie fut encore affirmé à cette occasion.

En 1835 (ou en 1836, selon certains auteurs) la Compagnie de la Baie d'Hudson racheta de la succession Selkirk tous les intérêts de la colonie, au prix de 25,000 livres. Ce fut alors que commença d'opérer régulièrement le Conseil d'Assiniboia qui fut l'institution juridique la plus intéressante et la plus avancée de toute cette époque. Le Conseil d'Assiniboia avait existé avant 1835 mais s'était contenté de quelques réunions (onze en tout) et avait été constitué d'une poignée d'officiers dont la fonction était tout simplement d'approuver ce que décidait le Gouverneur. Après 1835, le nombre des conseillers fut porté à quinze et ils furent choisis parmi les éléments les plus représentatifs de la colonie. Ils furent nommés par la Compagnie de la Baie d'Hudson sans doute, mais souvent en réponse aux demandes de la population. Entre 1835 et 1870 le Conseil d'Assiniboia se réunit 116 fois; il passa des ordonnances et des règlements affectant la vie de la colonie. Il arriva bientôt vers 1850, que le Conseil fut jugé suranné. Tout comme la Compagnie de la Baie

d'Hudson, dont il ne pouvait s'empêcher de refléter l'attitude, il prit habituellement les intérêts de la Compagnie mais le Conseil fut un corps législatif qui rendit de très grands services au sein d'un pays qui avait vécu longtemps sans loi. Son seul vice fut d'exister trop longtemps sans s'adapter aux conditions d'un pays changeant.

Le Conseil exerçait à la fois le pouvoir légal et judiciaire et devait nécessairement s'immiscer dans la vie quotidienne des habitants, tout comme dans leur vie sociale. Il agissait au moyen de comités responsables au Conseil. Ainsi on eut le Comité des Travaux Publics, qui voyait à l'état des routes et des ponts, ainsi qu'à leur construction.

Il y eut en plus du Comité des Travaux Publics celui qu'on pourrait appeler en français "comité du progrès" (the Committee of Economy) dont la fonction était d'encourager l'avancement matériel des habitants. Ainsi il organisait des expositions et offrait des prix pour les meilleurs produits. Il fit venir un moulin à fouler et, par l'intermédiaire de Monseigneur Provencher, un moulin à carder. Ce comité s'intéressa à la qualité des grains de semence et autres problèmes du genre.

Comment administrait-on la justice sous ce gouvernement aux allures patriarcales? On avait divisé la colonie en quatre sections judiciaires, avec magistrat ou juge de paix pour chacune qui pouvait juger des cas moins importants et des dettes de moins de 40 chelins. Tous les quatre mois il y avait une réunion de tous les magistrats avec le Gouverneur et le Conseil; on y examinait les décisions et on décidait des appels. On sait que la population métisse de langue française exigea du Recorder, qui fut plus tard nommé, qu'il sût les deux langues. Le Recorder en question était le célèbre Thom dont nous reparlerons. Le Conseil d'Assiniboia devait également légiférer quant aux douanes et aux taux d'accise.

Ces mesures déplurent à la population car elles empêchaient le seul commerce que les habitants pussent entreprendre, celui avec les États-Unis. Ils ne s'opposaient pas au trafic des spiritueux, surtout à cause des Indiens. On finit tout de même par établir une liste assez vaste d'objets exempts des frais de douane. Ces quelques exemples de législation et d'administration suffiront pour démontrer que le Conseil d'Assiniboia fut comme un précurseur dans le domaine de la législation et du pouvoir judiciaire. Il fut un temps où on dut tout de même élargir les cadres et même céder à la demande populaire. Il y a un siècle que se déroula l'événement dont nous allons parler.

En 1845 le Conseil d'Assiniboia passa une série de règlements resserrant la traite encore d'avantage et imposant des taux élevés sur presque toutes les marchandises importées des États-Unis, avec lesquels commençait de se faire un commerce important. Le Conseil avait agi sur l'avis du juge Thom. On accusait Thom d'être l'homme de la Compagnie; on le savait fanatique et entêté. L'année suivante, en 1846, une pétition couverte de 977 noms était remise à James Sinclair. On demandait aux autorités britanniques de déclarer et même imposer la liberté de la traite; on se plaignait de l'administration de la justice, alléguant que les magistrats étaient tous des créatures de la puissante Compagnie. Sinclair fit le voyage à Londres et remit la requête à un avocat de la métropole, A. K. Isbister, originaire de la Rivière Rouge, mais établi en Angleterre. Isbister la fit tenir à Earl Grey qui fit une enquête. La Compagnie, par

la bouche de Sir George Simpson, répondit à toutes les allégations et l'incident allait être clos lorsqu'au printemps de 1849 un métis français, Pierre Guillaume Sayer, fut arrêté par les hommes de la Compagnie. Trois autres métis, McGillis, de la Ronde et Goulet, furent également arrêtés et un nommé Fernando, Italien d'origine, qui était ferblantier de son métier, fut écroué et gardé en prison avec les fers aux pieds et aux mains pour avoir reçu des vivres et des fourrures en échange de son travail. Sayer était accusé d'un délit identique. Le procès avait été fixé au 17 mai.

Louis Riel, père du célèbre chef métis, avait formé un comité de citoyens ou de "Vigilants," comme il s'en est constitué dans bien des endroits où les pionniers durent exercer eux-mêmes la justice. Les habitudes du pays, surtout la chasse aux bisons, avaient accoutumé les gens à ce genre de gouvernements populaires. Au cours du procès, qui eut lieu à l'intérieur du Fort Garry, les Métis demandèrent l'acquittement de Sayer et la liberté de commerce. On dut remettre à Sayer les marchandises qu'on lui avait confisquées. La Compagnie cessa dès lors d'importuner les habitants et à partir de cette date le commerce fut libre. Cette victoire populaire fut comme un prélude au mouvement qui entraîna le Manitoba dans l'orbite de la Confédération canadienne.

Il n'entre pas dans le plan de cette modeste causerie de faire l'histoire des négociations qui eurent lieu lors de l'entrée de la nouvelle province dans la confédération canadienne. Il était généralement admis que la Compagnie de la Baie d'Hudson—qui avait racheté les droits de la succession Selkirk—avait la possession du sol qui lui avait été confié. Le professeur Chester Martin croit que c'était surtout ce droit que lui conférait la Charte, plus que les privilèges exclusifs qu'elle réclamait au point de vue commercial et qui s'alliaient difficilement avec les traditions britanniques. Quoi qu'il en soit, le gouvernement britannique négocia avec la Compagnie ou plutôt servit d'intermédiaire entre elle et le gouvernement canadien. Un fait à remarquer c'est que le gouvernement britannique retint tous les pouvoirs tant que la colonie ne devint pas partie intégrante du Canada.

Avant la passation de l'Acte du Manitoba il y eut le gouvernement provisoire de Riel et l'envoi des délégués à Ottawa, porteurs des vœux de la population de la Rivière Rouge. Le professeur Chester Martin s'indigne profondément du fait que le Bill of Rights accepté par la convention avait été modifié plus tard selon, dit-il, les vues de Monseigneur Taché. Il serait plus juste de dire qu'on lui ajouta une clause ou peut-être deux pour protéger les écoles de la minorité mais en substance ce fut le Bill tel qu'accepté par le Gouvernement Provisoire et les délégués des sections de la colonie. D'ailleurs le Bill fut ratifié plus tard au retour de la délégation. Il serait bien plus dans l'ordre de s'indigner de la manière que devait se faire, sans l'intervention des Métis et des colons en général, le transfert de la terre de Rupert au gouvernement du Canada. Il n'entraît pas dans la pensée de Sir John Macdonald, ni dans celle de Sir Georges Étienne Cartier, ni dans celle de McDougall qui fut nommé Lieutenant-Gouverneur des nouveaux territoires, de consulter le peuple de la Rivière-Rouge. Sir John Macdonald et les autres parlaient tout simplement d'annexer la colonie et la région sans plus de détails. Sir John qualifiait les gens de la Rivière Rouge de "wild people" que

le flot de "citoyens pacifiques et industriels" allait bientôt submerger. Les Métis, tant français qu'anglais formèrent leur gouvernement et négocièrent avec dignité et habileté. Leurs demandes portaient sur les points suivants; que Rupert's Land soit admise comme une des provinces de la Confédération, pas autrement; que deux membres de la colonie soient choisis pour le sénat et quatre pour les communes; que les terres soient contrôlées par la nouvelle province; que les deux langues aient pied d'égalité à la législature et à la cour. A la demande de sauvegarder les droits des citoyens en matières scolaires, l'Acte du Manitoba spécifia davantage et on inséra les deux mots "by practice" pour protéger les écoles confessionnelles existantes. Le gouvernement fédéral se réserva le droit de disposer des ressources naturelles de la nouvelle province, prétextant qu'il lui fallait se renflouer pour ce qu'il appelait "l'achat" fait à la compagnie de la Baie d'Hudson et avouant assez candidement qu'il pourrait ainsi mieux diriger l'émigration vers ces nouvelles contrées.

Telles étaient les grandes lignes de la législation nouvelle. Le système scolaire établi par l'Acte fonctionna durant vingt ans. En 1890 l'administration Greenway décida d'abolir les écoles séparées et de créer un nouveau système d'écoles, dites "écoles publiques," ouvertes à tous sans considération de religion ou de croyances. Ce fut l'origine de la célèbre "question des écoles du Manitoba" qui faillit donner le coup de mort au pacte fédératif. Le cas fut jugé par les juges des cours locales, puis par la Cour suprême du Canada, puis enfin par le Conseil privé, en deux occasions. Le résultat, au point de vue juridique, est que les mots "by practice" insérés dans l'Acte du Manitoba, ne pouvaient protéger les écoles confessionnelles si le législateur voulait les abolir, car seules les écoles existant avant l'Acte d'Union de 1841 avaient droit légal. Cette interprétation du Conseil privé, qui renversait celle de la Cour suprême du Canada, a été fortement critiquée comme s'attachant à la lettre ambiguë du texte sans en comprendre l'esprit. Par contre dans une seconde interprétation le Conseil privé affirma que la minorité catholique ayant joui des privilèges d'écoles séparées entre les années 1870 et 1890, le fait de les lui enlever en 1890 constituait un "préjudice" et qu'il était dans le pouvoir de l'autorité centrale d'y remédier par législation. Ce fut l'origine du "Bill Remédiateur" de Tupper que le parti libéral, dirigé par le jeune Laurier, tua dans l'oeuf.

En plus de la question des écoles, suscitée par le fanatisme le plus grossier, il eut litige entre les autorités fédérales et provinciales à propos du droit de permettre la construction des chemins de fer sur le territoire manitobain. La législature manitobaine finit par emporter le morceau. Plus tard les ressources naturelles furent remises à la province, sans heurt ni grand bruit. La minorité catholique espérait pouvoir s'en prévaloir pour alléger le fardeau qu'elle porte depuis 1890 mais en vain! Lassée des recours aux tribunaux elle attend des jours meilleurs. Ces jours viendront, nous en sommes convaincu, mais nul ne peut en prévoir l'heure.

Voici quelques pensées qui serviront de conclusion à cette vue à vol d'oiseau de la législation manitobaine. On a prétendu que les écoles confessionnelles n'avaient aucun statut légal au Manitoba avant 1870. Est-ce bien vrai? Comme on l'aura vu par les énoncés faits au cours de cette causerie, la situation juridique de la terre de Rupert est bien diffé-

rente de celle des vieilles provinces de l'est qui étaient en somme des colonies de l'Angleterre. Pour des raisons difficiles à comprendre l'Angleterre refusa d'imposer le système légal des colonies aux territoires de la Baie d'Hudson, mais les soumit à une législation particulière, si bien que le pays fut gouverné selon les lois de la Grande Bretagne. Or en Angleterre tout le système d'éducation avant 1870 était à base confessionnelle ou "denominational." Ce ne fut que le 9 août 1870 que le gouvernement impérial légiféra d'une manière précise à propos d'éducation. Avant cette date cependant, on reconnaissait en Angleterre les écoles confessionnelles "by practice" et elles avaient un certain statut légal.

Les tribunaux canadiens, en 1919, à propos du cas de divorce "Walker vs. Walker" ont déclaré que la législation qui s'appliquait dans ce cas, était le British Matrimonial Act de 1857 et le Conseil privé a ratifié ce point de vue. Donc les lois d'Angleterre s'appliquaient à Rupert's Land avant 1870, et par conséquent il aurait fallu juger des lois sur l'éducation à la lumière de la jurisprudence anglaise, et non selon la loi scolaire canadienne de 1841. Cet aspect seul de la question demanderait de longs développements, que les cadres actuels nous empêchent d'aborder. C'est encore là un des nombreux points des cent années de gouvernement et de législation à la Rivière Rouge, que nous sommes conscient d'avoir traité bien imparfaitement.

LAFONTAINE AND 1848 IN CANADA

By Rev. V. J. JENSEN, S.J.

St. Paul's College, Winnipeg

THE year 1848 was a year of revolutions—in Austria, France, Germany, and Italy. Even more fundamentally it was the year of the publication of the Communist Manifesto. In the provinces of central Canada, too, it was a year of revolution; but the revolution was of a most peculiar kind. There were no shots fired; there was no mounting of barricades; no rioting or bloodshed. It was accomplished on March 7 by the simple act of Lord Elgin summoning Mr. LaFontaine to form a government.

Lord Elgin's action was, in some respects, more revolutionary in its implications and its effects than the paper constitution over which the Frankfurt Assembly wrangled or the organization of the Second Republic which Louis Napoleon promised to maintain. It involved no less than the concession of self-government to the colony of Canada. With the attainment of what we call "Responsible Government" Canada took a long step towards nationhood; Canadian history from 1848 onward has been, fundamentally, little else than the application and extension of this principle of self-government. Even immediately its effects were far reaching. In November, 1848 Elgin wrote: "Looking then calmly at the state of feelings and parties both here and in the States, and at all that has occurred during the last 12 months, with the utmost desire to see things exactly as they are, I have no hesitation in expressing my conviction, that . . . if I had not allowed constitutional principles to have full scope and play during the General Election and in the subsequent modification of my cabinet, we should have by this hour either have been ignominiously expelled from Canada, or our relations with the United States would have been in a most precarious position."¹

Though the winning of self-government was revolutionary, it was by no means the only and perhaps not even the most important victory won in Canada in 1848. There was another conflict fought out in that fateful year which has equally affected the course of Canadian history and development. It was the struggle between Papineau and LaFontaine, termed by Elgin a "death struggle," for the leadership of the French-Canadian people. On the outcome of that struggle hinged the answer to the questions—would English and French-speaking people co-operate in a common system of government, in the solution of common problems? Would the Union hold? Could self-government be made to work? Would it transcend claims of race and nationality?

The key man for reaching a just estimate of the importance of the events of 1848 and for an understanding of these problems is Sir Louis Hippolyte LaFontaine. Not only was he the first prime minister of the provinces of Canada East and Canada West, but he was also the leader of the French-Canadian people; and he led them from a position of what Durham called "hopeless inferiority" to what is now full equality. The decision he took

¹A. G. Doughty (ed.), *Elgin-Grey Papers, 1846-1852* (4 vols., Ottawa, 1937), I, 264, Elgin to Grey, Nov. 30, 1948.

to fight for responsible government and to pursue a policy of racial co-operation have, for good or ill, left a permanent mark on Canadian politics and on the nation of Canada. I think, then, it is worth attempting an analysis of his political thinking and of the course of his policy which led him to a position so diametrically opposed to his erstwhile idol, Louis Joseph Papineau. The year 1848 was for him truly one of triumph.

As the winning of responsible government was a peculiar sort of revolution, so LaFontaine was a peculiar sort of revolutionary. In a speech at a banquet in his honour, in 1851, shortly after his resignation, LaFontaine said: "The danger today is the facility with which we may legislate."² That is a strange statement, surely, coming from a man who was a reformer elected on a reform platform; but it is a fit commentary on his own career. Fifteen years before, the danger had been that they could scarcely legislate at all. It is a commentary also on his mentality; for once having achieved the goal which he had set for himself he wished to proceed with caution. There was an innate conservatism about him. The movement of reform to which he had contributed so much was to go beyond him, to pass him by. Taché pointed this out in a letter of December 8, 1856, replying to LaFontaine's criticism of the bill to make the legislative council elective: "Vous avez posé les bases d'un gouvernement démocratique et les prémisses une fois admises, comment est-il possible de se refuser aux conséquences qui en découlent comme de sources?"³ The point is that eighteen years earlier LaFontaine had been among those advocating the application of the elective principle to the legislative council as a remedy for the political troubles of the eighteen-thirties. "Nous avons suggéré comme remède efficace l'application du principe électif comme étant un moyen sûr pour tous les partis."⁴

Such examples may be multiplied. On the one hand, we have Stanley, when colonial secretary, writing to Sir Robert Peel in 1842: "There would be, as it seems to me, something unnatural in such a position [that is, the admission of the French Canadians to the executive council] & something not very creditable in discarding the faithful adherents of British connexion and administering the Provinces by placing in high office such men as LaFontaine & Viger, the former of whom was among the most violent of the old French party & closely connected with the Lower Canada traitors. I am not prepared to carry the notion of colonial responsibility to such a length."⁵ On the other hand, we find Grey, in 1850, expressing keen regret at learning of LaFontaine's impending resignation. Lord John Russell urged that he be knighted by the Queen.

Again, an early governor, Gosford, described LaFontaine as "one of the most ultra" of Papineau's party; a later governor, Elgin, wrote that "his French party is the only one which can and will arrest this country in its progress towards the realization of the views of the extreme democrats."⁶

²*Ibid.*, III, 904, enclosure from *The Pilot*.

³Public Archives of Canada, LaFontaine Papers, vol. 7, Taché to LaFontaine, Dec. 8, 1856.

⁴P. A. C., Durham Papers, sec. VI, vol. 1, 342, LaFontaine to Ellice, Mar. 15, 1838.

⁵P. A. C., Bagot Papers, vol. 9, 145, Stanley to Peel, confidential, Aug. 27, 1842.

⁶W. Smith (ed.), *Calendar of the Durham Papers* (Ottawa, 1923), 268, Gosford to Glenelg, confidential, May 25, 1837. *Elgin-Grey Papers*, vol. 2, 613, Elgin to Grey, Mar. 23, 1850.

These contrasting views serve to show both the danger of too facile generalization and the difficulty of analysing LaFontaine's political theory. LaFontaine's thinking, as well as the realities of Canadian politics and especially the attitude of the Colonial Office, did not remain static. The political situation in 1848 differed radically from what it had been in 1838, in no small measure because of LaFontaine's work, and there was a corresponding change in his attitude towards the political problems of that day. The break between him and Papineau was overt; but the real, irreparable break had in fact occurred much earlier, although perhaps neither man realized it. Certainly Papineau had no real understanding of the fundamental importance of LaFontaine's achievements nor of the ultimate value of responsible government. In reality LaFontaine had gained that for which Papineau had fought; but in so doing he had turned his back on Papineau's methods and his ideas of a nation apart.

There were, nonetheless, constant elements in LaFontaine's thinking. In December, 1837 when he presented his petition for the convocation of the assembly, he explained to his father-in-law, Berthelot, his reasons for the petition. Of these, the most important was his anxiety that, should Lower Canada be deprived of its assembly, "nous deviendrions à coup sûr de vrais Acadiens."⁷ To prevent the reduction of the French Canadians to the status of the Acadians was the basic principle and the unchanging goal of his career.

A second constant element was, I think, a preference for constitutional parliamentary methods over militant revolutionary activities. He was convinced that the grievances of which the patriots of '37 complained could be redressed by constitutional means and only by constitutional means. Violence he deprecated and his petition to Gosford urged: "déplorant bien sincèrement l'état malheureux dans lequel se trouve maintenant une partie de cette province, vos petitionnaires n'aperçoivent d'autre remède efficace de rétablir la paix et l'harmonie que dans la convocation immédiate de la législature."⁸

In spite of the fears of Stanley and the claims of Metcalfe, a third constant element which seems to run through LaFontaine's political thinking was a high regard for British political institutions and for the British connection. In 1838 he wrote to Ellice: "Les Canadiens sont devenus par les traités sujets anglais. Ils doivent être traités comme tels."⁹ He resented the statements alleged to have been made by Sir Charles Metcalfe in 1844 that the reformers were aiming at separation and wrote to Baldwin: "What reasons had he to charge us and the majority of the people in Canada with disaffection and aiming at separation? Far from thinking of separation, I agree with you and I do not hesitate in saying that I sincerely believe it to be to the mutual interest both of England and Canada that the connection should subsist as long as possible—and a good government based upon our managing ourselves our local affairs will secure the connection."¹⁰

⁷A. D. Decelles, *LaFontaine et son temps* (Montreal, 1907), 14, LaFontaine to Berthelot, Dec. 17, 1837.

⁸LaFontaine Papers, vol. 2, Dec. 5, 1837.

⁹*Ibid.*, vol. 5, LaFontaine to Ellice, Apr. 18, 1838.

¹⁰Toronto Reference Library, Baldwin Papers, vol. 55, 64, LaFontaine to Baldwin, Feb. 15, 1844.

Why then was he considered one of the most ultra and violent of the adherents of Papineau? Certainly the ideas which he expressed in the eighteen-thirties were tinged with the republicanism of Papineau. In 1834 he wrote: "Nous sommes des traîtres, des rebelles, des séditeux, des révolutionnaires, dites vous, parce que nous demandons un changement dans notre constitution. Eh bien! quel est donc ce changement que nous demandons—c'est un conseil électif, ou bien en d'autres termes, nous demandons que le peuple choisisse ses législateurs."¹¹ Similarly in letters to Ellice, Hume, and Parkes he spoke of the natural democracy of American society to be found in Canada. Government in Canada based on any other principle than democracy was impossible; the only alternative was rule by force. But it is to be noted that he insisted that democracy was a principle equally essential to the government of England. He had great hopes for the success of the Durham mission because of Durham's liberal principles and universally admitted ability. These, he said, were a guarantee that Canada would be pacified and the liberties of the people preserved.¹² LaFontaine was, in many ways, a spiritual kin of the radicals of England.

It is worth remembering that while Papineau was in exile LaFontaine kept in touch with him and authorized a friend in Paris to advance Papineau any money he might require. He demanded that Metcalfe obtain a grant of "*nolle prosequi*" and allow Papineau to return to Canada; otherwise he and the Executive Council would resign. As late as December, 1845 he wrote to Papineau: "D'après la déclaration que vous m'avez faite hier que vous approuviez ma conduite politique, je vous ai fait part sans réserve des principaux événements auxquels j'avais été concerné depuis notre entrevue à Saratoga en juin 1838, jusqu'à l'époque de ma resignation en 1843. La même raison me fait devoir vous faire également part d'une correspondance récente d'une haute importance et d'un caractère tout confidentiel."¹³ Earlier LaFontaine had reassured Baldwin: "Mr. Papineau will return in September. . . . It appears that he approves of our course; but he gave Berthelot to understand that he will not interfere in politics any more."¹⁴ Hincks too wrote in October to Baldwin: "Papineau is here. LaFontaine called and saw him. No politics. He is right enough!"¹⁵ There was of course uneasiness in the reform camp about what Papineau's attitude would be; but these facts serve to show that there was not as yet an open break between the two French-Canadian reformers. They were in reality, however, poles apart in their political thinking and the struggle between them in 1848 only brought to the surface the profound and fundamental difference between them.

To Papineau the English government and English governors could never be trusted. England remained perfidious Albion. Responsible government was trickery, a mockery, deception, *une tromperie*. The Union was

¹¹L. H. LaFontaine, *Les Deux Girouettes* (Montreal, 1834), 74.

¹²LaFontaine Papers, vol. 5, LaFontaine to Ellice, Mar. 15, 20, Apr. 17, 29, 1838. *Ibid.*, vol. 2, LaFontaine to Hume, Mar. 24, 1838. Durham Papers, sec. VI, vol. I, 326 seq., LaFontaine to Parkes, Mar. 10, 1838.

¹³LaFontaine Papers, vol. 5, LaFontaine à Papineau, Dec. 6, 1845. The correspondence to which he refers is the Draper-Caron negotiations.

¹⁴Baldwin Papers, vol. 55, 55-6, Aug. 16, 1845.

¹⁵*Ibid.*, vol. 51, 93, Hincks to Baldwin, Oct. 12, 1845.

an act of the greatest injustice and the only remedy was to break it. He told his electors: "Tout ce que j'ai demandé en chambre en 1836 avec une si vaste majorité de mes collègues, appuyés que nous étions par une égale proportion dans la masse du peuple, je le redemande en 1847 et crois qu'il n'y a pas de contentement possible aussi longtemps que l'on n'aura pas satisfait à ces justes réclamations. . . . L'Angleterre ne veut pas encore nous donner et le pays est garnissoné pour qu'il ne les prenne pas."¹⁶

The Papineau of 1848 apparently had forgotten nothing and learned little since 1837. The political developments of the eighteen-forties, important as they were, only gave him fresh ammunition. *L'Avenir* expressed his opinions clearly, if somewhat rhetorically: "Entortillés, perdus dans les fictions du gouvernement constitutionnel anglais, corrompus par le patronage exorbitant qu'il donne à nos gouverneurs, les vrais libéraux n'existent plus. L'Union a tué parmi nous les principes. Au lieu d'un gouvernement basé sur la justice, sur des principes sains et vrais, nous avons un gouvernement au jour, le jour qui a pour mot d'ordre *le taisez-vous*, pour règle les *précédents anglais*, pour fin les écus."¹⁷

But the Papineau of 1848 was not the Papineau of 1837 in so far as the leadership of his people is concerned. Only one French Canadian (and two Tories) voted with him in his proposed amendment: "that this tranquility of the people of the Canadas [amidst the general uprisings in Europe in 1848] proves . . . that the Canadians of all classes and of all origins have shown themselves friendly to order to a degree proving them entitled of right to be endowed with political institutions much more liberal than the defective constitution imposed on them against their known and declared wishes." . . .¹⁸ Elgin described him and his adherents as "a faction disconnected from the body of the French Canadians."¹⁹

This change was effected by the leadership of LaFontaine. It was his leadership, working under new conditions, which gave to the French Canadians a new orientation and a new technique. The new conditions were brought about by the Act of Union; the new technique was that of responsible government and the new orientation was that of constructive co-operation with English-speaking people in solving common problems and in a common system of government.

The Act of Union was violently disliked in Lower Canada, first of all because the French Canadians were convinced that its purpose was to destroy their language and their institutions. It was inevitably associated in their minds with Lord Durham's *Report* and especially with his statements about the necessity of anglicizing the French Canadians. It was disliked both because of its terms, and because it was forced through by the Special Council against their representations. Papineau's attack on the Union and on LaFontaine for accepting it represented the state of mind of the French Canadians in 1841, but not in 1848. In fact in 1841 LaFontaine himself criticized the Union in strong terms: "Elle est un acte d'injustice et

¹⁶*Elgin-Grey Papers*, vol. 1, 108-9, "Adresse aux électeurs du Comté de Huntingdon," enclosed in despatch of Dec. 24, 1847.

¹⁷*L'Avenir*, Jan. 31, 1849, *Elgin-Grey Papers*, vol. 1, 292, enclosure with despatch of Jan. 29. Italics as in original.

¹⁸*Journals of the Legislative Assembly*, 2nd session, Jan. 22, 1848, third par., 16.

¹⁹*Elgin-Grey Papers*, I, 227, Elgin to Grey, Aug. 24, 1848.

de despotisme en ce qu'elle nous est imposée sans notre consentement; en ce qu'elle nous prive de l'usage de notre langue dans les procédés de la législature contre la foi des traités et la parole du gouverneur-général; en ce qu'elle nous fait payer sans notre consentement, une dette que nous n'avons pas contractée; en ce qu'elle permet à l'exécutif de s'emparer illégalement sous le nom de liste civile et sans le vote des représentants du peuple, d'une partie énorme des revenus du pays."²⁰ The editor of the *Quebec Gazette* claimed "we do not believe that there are a hundred electors in all Lower Canada who approve of the Union project on its own merits."²¹

Why then did LaFontaine accept the Union, bring his people to accept it, and attempt to make it work? Because he had come to see even before the Union Act was passed that the real importance of the Union lay in its implications. And the man who had made him see this, who radically changed his political thinking, who showed him a practical programme differing widely from Papineau's vague republicanism, was Francis Hincks.

Between April 12, 1839 and June, 1841 Hincks wrote thirty-six letters to LaFontaine (at least thirty-six are preserved in the LaFontaine Papers in the Archives) most of them at great length and all of them dealing with political theory and practice.

In his first letter Hincks wrote asking LaFontaine's opinion of the *Durham Report*: "Lord Durham ascribes to you national objects; if he is right Union would be ruin to you; if he is wrong and you are really desirous of liberal institutions and economical government, the Union would, in my opinion, give you all you could desire. . . . If we all combine as *Canadians* to promote the good of all classes in Canada there cannot be a doubt that under the new constitution worked as Lord Durham proposes the only party which would suffer would be the bureaucrats."²² In his second letter he wrote: "You say that you like the principles of government laid down in the report, but that we have no guarantee that they will be acted on. We certainly must have such a guarantee and I have no doubt that we shall obtain it. I wish we could convince you that a really responsible executive council would accomplish all that we want in spite of the legislative council. . . . On the Union question you should not mind Lord D's motives, but the effect of the scheme."²³ Two weeks later, in May, 1839, he continued: "I feel certain that if we once had responsible government as in England *without disfranchisement* we should in a very short time *obtain everything* we have ever asked."²⁴ In September, 1839 he wrote: "With regard to the Union, I think exactly as you, and I feel assured that it is for your interests that the provinces should be united provided always that you have no national objects in view. . . . Would the Canadians after what has passed ever be reconciled to the British connexion? Mr. Papineau says *not* under any circumstances."²⁵ Here was the first break between

²⁰L. P. Turcotte, *Le Canada sous l'union* (Quebec, 1871), 60 seq. Foot-note reproduces LaFontaine's "Adresse aux électeurs de Terrebonne."

²¹G. P. de T. Glazebrook, *Sir Charles Bagot in Canada* (Oxford, 1929), 27.

²²LaFontaine Papers, vol. 10, 2, Hincks to LaFontaine, Apr. 12, 1839 (only vols. 9 and 10 of these papers have pagination).

²³*Ibid.*, 3, idem, Apr. 20, 1839.

²⁴*Ibid.*, 8, idem, May 14, 1839.

²⁵*Ibid.*, 13, Sept. 9, 1839.

Papineau and LaFontaine. In November Hincks is writing: "Be assured that Union is the only chance for us Reformers. I am glad to find you are cautious in advocating it. I almost fear *Le Canadien* has said too much in its favour. Let the Tories fall into the pit of their own digging."²⁶ Again in December he urges: "I am now fully persuaded that the Union will be the only means of securing the liberties of the people. . . . For my own part my confidence in a United Legislature is unbounded. *We cannot be beat.* . . . You may depend upon it that we will never consent to a Union unless it be founded upon justice *to all classes.*"²⁷

Thus, long before the Union Act was passed or the Special Council was called, even before Poulett Thomson landed in Canada, Hincks was labouring to create a united reform party whose platform would be responsible government and self-government. He was aiming at real cabinet government. He knew from the state of politics in Upper Canada that a united, well organized, closely knit party could not be found there and that the strength and voting power must rest with a French group moulded into a solid unit and willing to co-operate on fundamental issues. The task of forming, keeping united, and leading such a group fell to LaFontaine. He had to convince his people that to break the Union would gain them nothing, that responsible government would give them everything they wanted, and that the issue at stake touched the fundamentals of government. To achieve this meant abandoning what Hincks called "national projects"; it meant abandoning the time-tried method of stopping supplies; it meant abandoning violence; it meant abandoning Papineau's technique and Papineau's views about the relations between English and French and between the assembly and the governor. That was a difficult step for LaFontaine to take because the bitterness aroused at the time of the Rebellion and fostered by the publication of Durham's *Report* had been increased and intensified by the terms of the Act of Union and the activities of Sydenham.

But LaFontaine saw beyond immediate issues. He was convinced that through the Union could be achieved responsible government, and through responsible government could be achieved all that Papineau had set out to win. He could save those rights which the French people thought the Union would destroy. As Hincks wrote in commenting on the Act:

I have already told you that I have always supported the Union *without reference to details* because by *it alone* I feel convinced that we should have a majority *that would make our tyrants succumb*. After what has taken place your countrymen would never obtain their rights in a Lower Canadian legislature. You want our help as much as we do yours. . . . Our liberties cannot be secured but by the Union. I know you think we shall never get responsible government, that the ministry are deceiving us—granted—but *we will make them give it whether they like it or not*. Above all things do not lose confidence in the sincerity of your Brother Reformers of U.C. We will not deceive you.²⁸

²⁶*Ibid.*, 27, Nov. 14, 1839.

²⁷*Ibid.*, 32-3, Dec. 4, 1839.

²⁸*Ibid.*, 67, June 17, 1840.

In fact, the real guarantee of the sincerity of the Upper Canadian reformers was the character of Robert Baldwin. Owing to the parts played by Hincks and Baldwin, the cause of constitutional government and the cause of French Canada became identified. That is why, in the same speech in which LaFontaine denounced the Act of Union as an act of injustice and despotism, he continued:

Je n'hésite pas à dire que je suis en faveur de ce principe anglais du gouvernement responsable. . . . Les colons doivent avoir la conduite de leurs propres affaires. Ils doivent diriger tous leurs efforts dans ce but; et pour y parvenir il faut que l'administration coloniale soit formée et dirigée par et avec la majorité des représentants du peuple. . . . Les Réformistes dans les deux provinces forment une majorité immense. . . . Notre cause est commune. Il est de l'intérêt des réformistes des deux provinces de se rencontrer sur le terrain législatif dans un esprit de paix, d'union, d'amitié et de fraternité.²⁹

This speech was made in 1841; but to the principles in it he always remained faithful and by means of them he held his party together during the lean and hungry years while every alternative to cabinet government was being exhausted. The reward came in March, 1848 when Elgin summoned him to form a government. It was fortunate for Canada that he did so, for in May, Elgin remarked to Grey:

Bear in mind that one half of our population is of French origin, and deeply imbued with French sympathies,—that a considerable portion of the remainder consists of Irish Catholics—that a large Irish contingent on the other side of the border—fanatics on behalf of republicanism and repeal—are egging on their compatriots here to rebellion—that all have been wrought upon until they believe that the conduct of England to Ireland is only to be paralleled by that of Russia to Poland—that on this exciting topic therefore something of a holy indignation mixes itself with more questionable impulses—that Guy Fawkes Papineau . . . is waving a lighted torch among these combustibles—you will, I think admit, that if we pass through this crisis without explosions, it will be a gratifying circumstance and an encouragement to persevere in a liberal and straightforward application of constitutional principles to Govt.³⁰

How far-reaching LaFontaine and his followers considered responsible government and how far he led his people away from Papineau can best be illustrated, I think, by an article which appeared in LaFontaine's paper, *La Revue Canadienne*, in reply to Papineau:

Tell us gentlemen of *L'Avenir* who weep so much over the ruins of the past and over imaginary evils—tell us at what period of our history the French Canadian nationality has been more brilliant, more honored, more respected, or has occupied a higher position than that which it occupies this day? . . . A worse moment could not be chosen to revolutionize Canada. . . . The people has been fed so badly with theories and as a consequence with interminable and useless battles

²⁹Turcotte, *Le Canada sous l'union*, 60-1, note.

³⁰*Elgin-Grey Papers*, I, 149, Elgin to Grey, May 4, 1848.

before the union, that at present, when it has the power in its hands (which it never had then) when it sees the men it has chosen to represent it, in the Councils of the Sovereign, and truly governing the people in her name—the people, we say, will consider extremely injurious . . . strange, and fantastic, this idea of yours to overturn the actual order of things, and replace it by a “republic one and indivisible”, or by any other thing still more marvellous. . . .

But tell us ye, young and fiery apostles of the Franco-Canadian nationality, what do you mean by the principle of nationality applied to the management of public affairs? . . . Is it, *par hasard*, that famous principle of public action which has excited the French lately to drive from France all workmen of English or foreign origin? If it be a principle so advanced as that, which you wish to implant on the Canadian soil, you lose your time and your pains. It is not after the party has recruited its ranks with men of all origins when our friends the liberals of Upper Canada, and those of Lower Canada of foreign origin, have made prodigious efforts to carry the elections and that altogether we have gained the most signal victory—it is not now that your appeal to prejudice and passions will have the least echo in the country. The people will laugh at your beards and it will have reason. . . .

We would wager that our compatriots, however they may admire the French revolution, prefer responsible government with its perspective, to the provisional government of Paris with the menacing and sombre horizons that it presents. . . .

The people desires to remain united and strong in this same union.³¹

From this it is clear how profound a change had been wrought in French Canada, and indeed in the whole of Canada, by LaFontaine's Work. Having accepted the decision to fight for self-government, he fought it through to the end. Having accepted the Union and the necessity of racial co-operation, he led his people from factious opposition to a full share in the government. He had, in some respects, committed Canada to federalism. As a result of his work I wonder if Elgin, optimist though he was inclined to be, was not justified in asking: “who will venture to say that the last hand which waves the British flag on American ground may not be that of a French Canadian”?³²

³¹*Ibid.*, I, 156-9, enclosure with despatch of May 4, 1848, as printed in the *Conservative Herald*.

³²*Ibid.*, I, 150.

1848 IN RETROSPECT: EVENTS IN NOVA SCOTIA AND CANADA

By R. S. LONGLEY, *Acadia University*

ONE hundred years ago many thrones in continental Europe were being shaken or overthrown by restless and oppressed peoples seeking national self-determination, better economic opportunities, and constitutional government. Revolutions, like epidemics, seek for weak places, and the Europe of 1848 was full of weak places. The British monarchy, on the other hand, not only stood firm, but even increased in strength. That principle, which Queen Victoria once described as "constitutional fiction,"¹ whereby the monarch acts by the advice of responsible ministers, while far from perfect, had given the British people sufficient confidence in their ability to obtain peaceful reforms that appeals to force were considered unnecessary. Chartists and young Irishmen were causing the government some concern, but for the most part Britain's political skies were clear.

In British North America also, the year 1848 was a significant date, for here, where Reformers had long protested against the arbitrary acts of irresponsible officials, the people were granted the benefits of the Queen's "constitutional fiction" as they existed in the Mother Country. Responsible government was assured when Lord John Russell gave the Colonial Seals to the Durhamite Peer, Lord Grey, in June, 1846, but it was not established constitutionally until two years later. Its achievement coincided with the revolutions of Europe, and throughout the colonies it proved a bulwark against the forces of disloyalty and rebellion.

On February 2, 1848, nearly three weeks before the Paris mob set the European continent ablaze, James Boyle Uniacke of Nova Scotia was called to office by the lieutenant-governor, Sir John Harvey, and formed the first Executive Council to be chosen exclusively from the party having a majority in the elected branch of a colonial legislature.² Its best-known member, Joseph Howe, expressed deep satisfaction with the change. "You cannot imagine," he wrote to the English Reformer, Charles Buller, "the calmness with which we North Americans survey the political scene shifting in Europe just now."³ In his enthusiasm, he suggested that responsible government might be used to cure the ills of Ireland. It was his desire to make Nova Scotia a normal school of constitutional procedure so that the sister provinces might observe how representative institutions could promote internal tranquility.⁴ These were the words of the man who had opposed Sir Colin Campbell, quarrelled with Lord Falkland, and warned the Russell Government

¹A. C. Benson and Viscount Esther, *Letters of Queen Victoria, 1831-67* (3 vols., London, 1908), II, 95, Queen Victoria to Lord John Russell, Aug. 7, 1848.

²At the opening of the Assembly in March, a plaque, given by the Canadian Historic Sites and Monuments Board, was unveiled at Province House in Halifax to commemorate the centennial of responsible government in British North America.

³"The Howe-Buller Correspondence," ed. Chester Martin (*Canadian Historical Review*, VI, 1925, 329), Howe to Buller, Mar. 14, 1848.

⁴*Ibid.*, 326, Howe to Buller, Feb. 12, 1848.

that if it failed the colonies, the questions at issue would be settled ten years hence by the foes rather than by the friends of Britain. In office, he became a contented and responsible minister.

Three days after the peaceful change of government in Nova Scotia, Lord Elgin wrote to the Colonial Office from Montreal to report the probable defeat in the elections then being held, of the weak administration he had inherited from his predecessor, Sir Charles Metcalfe, and of his intention of subjecting the province of Canada to an "interesting crisis" by calling to office members of the opposing party whom Metcalfe and Lord Stanley had described as "impracticable and disloyal."⁵ He was not without some misgivings as to its success, but he considered it expedient and necessary. Early in the following month LaFontaine and Baldwin returned to office after four years in opposition, this time at the head of a ministry of their own choosing. A government composed of both English- and French-speaking members, guided by a constitutional governor, and supported by an enthusiastic majority in a newly-elected legislature had sufficient prestige to thwart the schemes of noisy agitators and Irish Repealers. The members accepted Lord Elgin's assertion in the Speech from the Throne that the people enjoyed the blessings of peace through their own patriotism and *their connection with a just and powerful state*, and an opposition amendment by Louis Joseph Papineau found no support.⁶ LaFontaine and Baldwin, like Howe of Nova Scotia, were conscious of their new responsibilities, and their newspapers, such as the *Toronto Globe* and the *Revue Canadienne*, poured scorn upon the vitriolic editorials of Papineau's *L'Avenir*.⁷ Lord Grey cast many an anxious look at the chaos and confusion across the English Channel, and contrasted the situation there with the order and contentment in British North America. With the traditional Briton's doubt concerning Lower Canadian loyalty, and a superb confidence in the efficacy of British institutions to cure all political ills, he expressed great satisfaction that French Canadians had accepted the responsibilities of office before the news of Louis Phillipe's flight from Paris had reached Montreal.⁸ He was far from certain that any but Anglo-Saxons could properly appreciate and administer the British constitution, but his confidence in the governor-general, Lord Elgin, was sufficiently great to convince him that, if the experiment now being tried were to fail, its failure was inevitable.⁹ Elgin's success exceeded his fondest hopes. The far-sighted policy of men such as Grey and Elgin, and the loyal support given them by such colonial statesmen as Louis LaFontaine, Robert Baldwin, and Joseph Howe, are worthy of renewed commendation in this centennial year. Of these, none deserves a greater tribute than Henry George, third Earl Grey.

⁵*Elgin-Grey Papers*, ed. Sir Arthur Doughty (4 vols., Ottawa, 1937), I, 123, Elgin to Grey, Feb. 5, 1848.

⁶*Ibid.*, 134, Elgin to Grey, Mar. 17, 1848.

⁷*L'Avenir* was the newspaper mouthpiece of Papineau. The *Globe* supported Baldwin, and *Revue Canadienne* spoke for LaFontaine.

⁸*Elgin-Grey Papers*, I, 138, Elgin to Grey, Apr. 14, 1848.

⁹*Ibid.*, 125, Elgin to Grey, Mar. 22, 1848.

II

Lord Grey was born in 1802. At the early age of twenty-four he was elected to the House of Commons, and before he was thirty he held a Cabinet portfolio. He was too independent and outspoken ever to be a popular leader or colleague, but he was an able administrator. Sir Henry Taylor, who served under thirteen different secretaries of state, considered Grey the ablest of them all.¹⁰ His appointment to the Colonial Office was timely, and considering the vicissitudes of British political parties, most fortunate.

Grey asked to have Charles Buller as his assistant, but the appointment went to Benjamin Hawes. Buller was made advocate-general, with the understanding that he was to assist in colonial matters.¹¹ He saw most of Grey's despatches and gave much practical advice. As the friend and associate of Lord Durham, he had the confidence of the colonial Reformers, and was able to act as a liaison officer between them and Downing Street. His correspondence with Joseph Howe enabled him tactfully to inform members of colonial legislatures that they, as well as representatives of the Crown, must learn to act constitutionally. The Howe-Buller letters, while few in number, are as significant in their way for the events of 1848 as are the better known letters of Elgin and Grey.

Since the publication of the *Durham Report*, impatient Reformers such as Molesworth, Buller, Hume, and Roebuck, had often asserted that the policy of the Colonial Office was unprogressive and sometimes reactionary. Molesworth declared that efficient colonial government meant self-government. "Ours is a sad Colonial system," wrote Buller to Howe, "even with all recent concessions. In my eyes the almost sole business of the Colonial Office should be to breed up a supply of good Colonial Governors and then leave them and you to manage your own affairs. Our practice is to neglect the one duty, and meddle in everything else."¹² Hume blandly suggested that more effective reforms could be produced if the Colonial Office were "locked up."¹³ Russell's colonial secretary silenced such critics. In the words of the *London Times*, there was a "stir and movement" in the office of Lord Grey, which were indicative of great events.¹⁴

As a well-known free-trader, Grey recognized that since 1846 the colonies could not be considered of great economic value to the Mother Country, but he would not accept the full implications of the Cobden School, that they were liabilities. He agreed with Arthur Roebuck that colonies enabled Britain to "acquire a power and influence which her own narrow territory might not permit her to attain."¹⁵ As the colonies still needed the guidance and protection of the Mother Country, a working agreement between them was essential; in this agreement the representatives of the Crown must play an important part.¹⁶ It was

¹⁰W. P. Morrell, *Colonial Policy in the Age of Russell and Peel* (Oxford, 1930), 203.

¹¹*Ibid.*, 302.

¹²"Howe-Buller Correspondence," 316, Howe to Buller, Sept. 10, 1846.

¹³*The Annual Register*, 1848, 16.

¹⁴*The Times*, Jan. 27, 1847, Morrell, 472.

¹⁵Klaus K. Knorr, *British Colonial Theories* (Toronto, 1944), 352.

¹⁶*Elgin-Grey Papers*, 143 and 146, Grey to Elgin, May 4 and 14, 1848. Grey *Colonial Policy of Lord John Russell's Administration* (2 vols., London, 1853), I, 207 ff.

Grey's desire to give each colony that form of government which best suited its political condition. In British North America, where representative institutions had reached their full development, the governor's task was to guide and advise responsible ministers with a minimum of interference. The earlier Sydenham-Russell theory that full responsible government was incompatible with the proper exercise of the Queen's prerogative must be discarded. Any governor who showed a preference for one political party and doubted or feared its opponents, sowed the seeds of future discord and strife, as sooner or later, under the British system, the opposition party comes to power. It was here that Sir Charles Metcalfe and Lord Falkland failed; they assumed that the Home authorities had more connection with, and more confidence in, one political party than another.¹⁷ In Grey's opinion Metcalfe failed in Canada because he did not understand properly the system that he was seeking to administer.¹⁸ Buller wrote Howe that the colonies were fortunate to have a colonial secretary with such sound views, but he hastened to add that the good results of the new administration could not be expected for some years, as it would take time to find and train governors who would carry out Grey's policy.¹⁹ The delay was not as long as Buller feared; Elgin agreed to Grey's plans before he left England, and the venerable Sir John Harvey proved teachable. With Nova Scotia and Canada giving enthusiastic support to responsible ministries, the system soon spread to the other provinces. Since Harvey and Elgin were the key figures in the Grey policy, a brief comparison of their problems and methods will be of interest.

III

Sir John Harvey came to Nova Scotia at the age of seventy after a long and honourable career as a soldier and colonial governor. Known in his younger days as the "Handsome Colonel Harvey," he was bland, courteous, diplomatic, and given to blarney. As lieutenant-governor of New Brunswick and Newfoundland, he was unusually popular, and left these governments in excellent condition. Lord Sydenham, who visited him at Fredericton in 1840, thought him, except for a tendency to verbosity, "the pearl of civil governors."²⁰

Harvey had accepted the appointment to Nova Scotia before Grey became colonial secretary. Buller told Howe that a civilian might have been better, but remembering the experience of Falkland and Metcalfe, he hastened to add, "we could have laid our hands on so many much worse." On the whole, he thought the province fortunate in getting a man who by his past record was unlikely to favour any particular party or individuals.²¹ Unfortunately Harvey held the Sydenham theory that political parties were injurious to proper colonial development, and without the guidance of Grey, he might have ended his long and honour-

¹⁷*Elgin-Grey Papers*, I, 38, Grey to Elgin, June 2, 1847; I, 138, Grey to Elgin, Apr. 14, 1848.

¹⁸*Ibid.*, 317, Grey to Elgin, Apr. 5, 1848; I, 56, Grey to Elgin, July 19, 1847.

¹⁹"Howe-Buller Correspondence," 316, Howe to Buller, Sept. 10, 1846.

²⁰Paul Knaplund, *The Letters of Lord Sydenham, Governor-General of Canada, 1839-41 to Lord John Russell* (London, 1941), 84, Sydenham to Russell, July 27, 1840.

²¹"Howe-Buller Correspondence," 316, Buller to Howe, Sept. 10, 1846.

able career, as his friend, John Kent of Newfoundland feared he would, in intrigues and quarrels.²²

Harvey faced a difficult situation. Lord Sydenham's visit to Nova Scotia in 1840 to settle what he called "a storm in a puddle" gave to the lieutenant-governor, Lord Falkland, a coalition or no-party Executive Council, of six Conservatives and three Reformers, in which the severe and courtly James W. Johnston and the impulsive, boisterous Joseph Howe were required to work together. The two men differed temperamentally and politically. Johnston supported denominational colleges; Howe advocated a provincial university. Howe demanded equality in appointments and patronage; Falkland dissolved the House on the advice of Johnston alone, and appointed a Conservative to the first executive vacancy. Finally in December, 1843, the three Reformers, Howe, Uniacke, and McNab, left the Council and could not be induced to return; Johnston carried on with a rump executive until his resignation in January, 1848. Falkland's obvious preference for Johnston and the Conservatives, and his somewhat undiplomatic efforts to conciliate the Reformers, aroused Howe's anger; the Falkland-Howe quarrel of 1845-6 was not to the credit of either participant.²³

In conformity with his political beliefs and past experiences, Harvey at once began negotiations to restore the coalition. Since he was convinced that the differences were personal rather than political, he desired to act as mediator and moderator between the two groups. He would not, he told the Reform leaders, identify himself with any *one* party, but would have his government rest upon the support of *all*.²⁴ Two days later he wrote Grey of his plans. Responsible or party government in Nova Scotia, if not inconsistent with its proper relation to the parent state, tended to array one class of Her Majesty's subjects against the other and to create elements of strife which need not and do not exist, thus perpetuating agitation and making repose impossible.²⁵

Harvey might dislike party differences, but he could neither eliminate nor ignore them. The Reformers had consolidated their strength and called themselves the Great Liberals. They believed public opinion was with them, and that a coalition would defeat their aims. In addition, Howe and Uniacke shared a common ambition to triumph over those "who planned and endeavoured to work out the dirty intrigue of 1843."²⁶ Howe knew of Harvey's appeal to Grey, and wrote Buller to give his Lordship good advice. The problem could be solved by dissolving the Nova Scotia Assembly. If this were done, there would be no further trouble from Nova Scotia for four years.²⁷ Uniacke, who was in London, lent his personal influence to this end, although he was by no means sure that the province was ready for the party government which might result.²⁸

²²Chester Martin, *Empire and Commonwealth* (Oxford, 1929), 228.

²³Sir Joseph Chisholm, *Speeches and Public Letters of Joseph Howe* (2 vols., Halifax, 1909), I; Martin, *Empire and Commonwealth*; Ross Livingstone, *Responsible Government in Nova Scotia* (Iowa City, 1930).

²⁴*Novascotian*, Feb. 8, 1847, Harvey to Howe, L. O. Doyle, and George Young, Sept. 14, 1846.

²⁵Morrell, *Colonial Policy*, 461, Harvey to Grey, Sept. 16, 1846.

²⁶P. A. C., Howe Papers, I, 171, Uniacke to Howe, Oct. 19, 1846.

²⁷"Howe-Buller Correspondence," 318, Howe to Buller, Sept. 16, 1846.

²⁸Howe Papers, Uniacke to Howe, Oct. 19, 1846.

Grey and Buller considered Howe's suggestion, but found it neither constitutional nor expedient. A few weeks before, Lord John Russell had approached the Crown with a similar proposal. In reply, the Queen pointed out that the power of dissolution is a most valuable and powerful instrument in the hands of the monarch, and ought to be used only in extreme cases.²⁹ Sir Robert Peel had expressed similar views, and had declined to advise the use of dissolution to gain a party advantage. Howe not only wanted a dissolution for the benefit of his party, but would have it against the advice of the existing executive. Buller was delegated to inform Howe of his weak position. If Johnston's Council met defeat in the Assembly, or gave the lieutenant-governor advice he could not accept, they would be expected to resign. If a new ministry advised dissolution, it could be granted. Otherwise the Reformers should wait until the general election, which must come in 1847. By following this procedure, they would pay real, and not lip service to the principle they were seeking to establish. Buller concluded with a personal word of encouragement. Lord Grey was determined to act constitutionally. The Reformers would therefore do well to avoid the entanglements of a composite ministry, since "Coalitions always damage all engaged to them and fail all who lean on them."³⁰

Grey's famous letter of November 6, 1846, followed the same constitutional arguments. Sir John should carry on with his existing Council as long as it commanded the support of the Assembly. Should this Council be defeated or resign, and a new Council be formed, there could be "no impropriety in dissolving the Assembly on their advice." But whatever the procedure, he must make it clear that any transfer of political power from one party to another was the result, not of the governor's action, but of the wishes of the people themselves.³¹

Perhaps Harvey failed to grasp what Grey wished, or as is more likely, he was still determined to have his coalition. But renewed negotiations with the two groups produced nothing but fresh recriminations and accusations.³² An appeal to Grey brought the curt reminder that Harvey was not instructed to use his *own judgment*, but only to use his discretion as to how and when the principles enunciated by Grey were to be applied to the political situation in Nova Scotia.³³ The colonial secretary agreed with Buller that coalitions rarely succeed, and he therefore instructed Harvey to retain his existing Council until the issues between the parties could be settled at the hustings.³⁴ His chief concern was not that the political complexion of the government might change, but for the probable dismissals and political patronage which would result.³⁵ Harvey took his advice and awaited the elections.

The elections were held on August 5, 1847, the first such contest in

²⁹Benson and Esher, *Letters to Queen Victoria*, II, 95, Queen Victoria to Lord John Russell, July 16, 1846.

³⁰"Howe-Buller Correspondence," 322, Buller to Howe, Nov. 16, 1846.

³¹W. P. M. Kennedy, *Documents of the Canadian Constitution* (Oxford, 1930), 495, Grey to Harvey, Nov. 3, 1846.

³²*Novascotian*, Feb. 8, 1847.

³³P. A. N. S., Letter Books, Falkland and Harvey, Grey to Harvey, Dec. 22 and 23, 1846.

³⁴*Novascotian*, Jan. 31, 1848, Grey to Harvey, Mar. 2, 1847.

³⁵*Ibid.* Also, Kennedy, *Documents*, 496-500, Grey to Harvey, Mar. 31, 1847.

British North America to be decided in a single day. The Reformers won twenty-nine seats in a House of fifty-one and not unnaturally expected to be summoned to office. But Johnston showed no intention of resigning without a vote of want of confidence, and he refused to advise a special session of the Assembly. Thus it was not until January, 1848, that the vote of want of confidence could be passed. Meanwhile, Howe and his colleagues declared that any action taken by the defeated ministry could have no validity, and that needed legislation was being delayed. Harvey, however, had learned his lesson, and refused to interfere. He expected, he told Grey, shortly to form "a strong and efficient government."³⁶ A few weeks later he rejoiced that Grey's policy had effectively removed from the colony a source of contention which had perplexed its councils and embarrassed its public men for fifteen years.³⁷ Howe realized that Nova Scotia was making history, and that the success or failure of Grey's policy was in his hands. He assured Buller that he and his colleagues would "keep within the ropes," and the pledge was kept.³⁸

The Uniacke-Howe ministry consisted of nine members, six of whom held seats in the Assembly and three in the Legislative Council. At first only three had particular portfolios, but the number was soon increased. The ministers had ample powers and proceeded to use them. During the first session eight important bills were passed. The civil list was revised, the casual and territorial revenues were taken over, the customs administration was consolidated, the financial and provincial secretaries were made responsible ministers, plans were made to take over the control of the provincial post office, and efforts were made to improve the means of communication. "Measures so varied and important emanating from the Government have never before in Nova Scotia been carried out in a single session," Harvey informed Grey with considerable pride.³⁹ The *Novascotian*, which spoke for the Reformers, commended the lieutenant-governor. King Louis Philippe made no concessions, it declared, and became an exile. Sir John Harvey learned to make concessions; he imitates as well as represents his sovereign.⁴⁰

IV

As has been suggested, Lord Elgin became an advocate of Grey's policy before he left England; hence events in the Canadas proceeded more smoothly and with greater rapidity than in Nova Scotia.

Elgin was a product of Eton and Oxford. He was a man of keen intellect, diplomatic skill, flashing wit, and incisive speech. By birth and early education he was a Conservative, and as a member of the Commons in 1841 he had taken an active part in the overthrow of the Melbourne Ministry. His first diplomatic post, governor of Jamaica, was a gift of a Conservative Government, and it was the Conservative Stanley who suggested that he become governor-general of British

³⁶Letter Books, Harvey to Grey, Jan. 27, 1848.

³⁷*Ibid.*, Harvey to Grey, Apr. 15, 1848.

³⁸"Howe-Buller Correspondence," 326, Howe to Buller, Feb. 12, 1848.

³⁹Letter Books, Harvey to Grey, Apr. 6, 1848.

⁴⁰*Novascotian*, June 12, 1848.

North America. In Jamaica, where he had almost unlimited authority, he managed affairs so well that Queen Victoria thought he would make an admirable successor to Sir Charles Metcalfe whose "judicious system" she desired to have continued.⁴¹ When Sir Robert Peel resigned in 1846, the Prince Consort wrote Lord Grey of Her Majesty's approval of Metcalfe's "prudent, consistent, and impartial administration," and that Lord Elgin was well fitted to secure "an interrupted development of Lord Metcalfe's views."⁴² Grey must have been amused at the Queen's estimate of Metcalfe, but on the following day he invited Elgin to go to Canada.⁴³ At the time he was not acquainted with his appointee, but knew of his ability, and he wished "to entrust the management of the largest and most important of the British colonies in a season of great difficulty" to the ablest hands he could find.⁴⁴ Elgin married Lord Durham's daughter, and became an enthusiastic Durhamite. As such he came to the Canadas. He resolved to keep himself free from party conflicts and to lift Canadian politics "from the mud."

Elgin believed that responsible government should have been a part of the union of 1841, and marvelled at "what study of human nature or of history led Lord Sydenham to the conclusion that it would be possible to concede to a pushing and enterprising people, unencumbered by an aristocracy and dwelling in the immediate vicinity of the United States, such constitutional privileges as were conferred on Canada and yet restrict in practice their power of self-government as he proposed."⁴⁵ He saw no reason why Durham's division of powers between imperial and local authorities could not be followed, and if excessive patronage were feared when the Reformers took office, it ought to be remembered that Draper and his Tory colleagues used patronage with "as little scruple as their predecessors."⁴⁶

In conformity with his own views and those of Lord Grey, Elgin did not seek to change the composition of his executive without their consent, but suggested that they meet Parliament with progressive legislation and the prestige of a new governor, or seek to strengthen their support in the Assembly by inviting French Canadians to enter the Council. They chose the second alternative, but LaFontaine would not unite with the Tories, and kept his supporters in line. Elgin remained aloof from the negotiations, but made it clear to the French that he was willing to have them in office.⁴⁷ The *Globe* declared that at last the province had been given a constitutional governor. Finally, acting on the advice of the executive, the governor dissolved the Assembly in December, 1847. The ministers hoped to gain from the elections, but the times were against them; the spirit of reform was in the air, and the economic depression since 1846 made the Government unpopular. At first the governor could see little evidence of a change, but by the close of the first week of January, he was convinced he would have new advisers.⁴⁸

⁴¹Benson and Esher, *Letters of Queen Victoria*, II, 46-7, Queen Victoria to Lord Stanley, Nov. 2, 1845.

⁴²*Ibid.*, 94, Prince Albert to Grey, Aug. 3, 1846.

⁴³*Elgin-Grey Papers*, I, 3, Grey to Elgin, Aug. 4, 1846.

⁴⁴Grey, *Colonial Policy of Lord John Russell's Administration*, I, 208.

⁴⁵*Elgin-Grey Papers*, I, 29, Elgin to Grey, Apr. 26, 1847.

⁴⁶*Ibid.*, 136, Elgin to Grey, Mar. 17, 1848.

⁴⁷*Ibid.*, 28, Elgin to Grey, Apr. 26, 1847.

⁴⁸*Elgin-Grey Papers*, I, 117, Elgin to Grey, Jan. 7, 1848.

The final returns gave the opposition fifty-nine of the eighty-four seats. Elgin offered his ministers the choice of immediate resignation, or of meeting Parliament without unnecessary delay.⁴⁹ They chose the second alternative, but the Assembly was not summoned for several weeks. While the wait was not as long as in Nova Scotia, the governor faced the same problem which had disturbed Harvey's peace of mind for five months, the desire of the defeated party to make midnight appointments.⁵⁰ Grey's despatches to Harvey on this important question had been published in Nova Scotia and reached Montreal. Elgin believed they did good. He agreed with Grey that only the political offices should be changed, but he feared that his new ministers would deal, as he put it, "Yankee fashion" with their opponents. It was certain to be difficult for LaFontaine and Baldwin to satisfy the scores of office seekers. In Nova Scotia, Uniacke and Howe faced a similar problem, but considering the provocations and opportunities, patronage under responsible government did not get seriously out of hand.

V

Such Reformers as Cobden and Molesworth had long complained that the inhabitants of the colonies were economically better off than the masses of England who were taxed for their defence.⁵¹ Molesworth had a simple solution to the problem; self-government should be accompanied by self-help.⁵² Grey agreed with this policy. "Self-government," he declared, "ought to carry with it corresponding responsibilities, and the time has now come when the people of Canada must be called upon to take upon themselves a larger share than they have hitherto done of expenses incurred on their account."⁵³ He believed, however, that such an important step should be approached with caution, and that it must be preceded by some form of inter-provincial organization, possibly a federal union. If the provinces were united, they could formulate a British American Zollverein, provide for their own defence, agree upon a progressive policy of railway construction, promote immigration, and control the postal services. Elgin came to Canada pledged to promote a federal union, but a study of the local conditions convinced him that Durham was correct in thinking that an intercolonial railway was a necessary preliminary.⁵⁴ Both Elgin and Grey saw the importance of a railway for opening new lands, and providing adequate transportation, especially for defence, and Grey made a number of proposals to combine the construction of an intercolonial railroad with a planned system of colonization. But the "Little Englanders" refused to support such a plan, and it was finally dropped. The Robinson Report of 1848 aroused the ambitions of the provinces, and they pledged their support to the railway. In the end, however, nothing was done and Grey's later letters became little more than an "awkward excuse for doing nothing."⁵⁵

⁴⁹*Ibid.*, 127, Algin to Grey, Mar. 2, 1848.

⁵⁰*Ibid.*

⁵¹Knorr, *British Colonial Theories*, 352.

⁵²Morrell, *Colonial Policy*, 474, from a speech by Molesworth in the House of Commons.

⁵³Grey, *Colonial Policy of Lord Russell's Administration*, I, 260.

⁵⁴*Durham Report* (Methuen ed.), 235.

⁵⁵*Elgin-Grey Papers*, I, 316, Grey to Elgin, Apr. 5, 1849.

As a major step toward his desired goal of interprovincial co-operation, Grey instructed Elgin to call an interprovincial conference for October, 1847. Howe informed Buller that the delegates would discuss a Zollverein, a North American post office, railroads, and colonization.⁵⁶ He was greatly annoyed because Johnston, who had recently met defeat at the polls, insisted upon representing Nova Scotia. "Nova Scotia can take no effective part in these important questions," he wrote, "till we have a Government."⁵⁷ Harvey told Elgin that constitutionally he could not do otherwise than appoint Johnston, but he feared that any policy the latter might advocate would be rejected at the next session of the Assembly.⁵⁸ New Brunswick was represented by R. L. Hazen who was not in close touch with his province, and Canada by the rather colourless inspector-general, William Cayley. Consequently, this first conference was noted more for its pioneering efforts than for its accomplishments. Its most important work was in making provision for a local administration of the colonial post office.

Up to 1846 the postal services in British North America were administered from London through a deputy residing in the colonies. The system did not prove entirely satisfactory, and with the growth of colonial self-government, the postmaster general, Lord Clanricarde, proposed to hand over the administration of the post office to the provinces. Grey favoured the plan, and instructed that it be discussed at the interprovincial conference. It was finally decided that a central administration was at present impracticable, and that each province should control the postal services within its own borders. A uniform letter rate of 3d. was agreed upon.⁵⁹ The agreement was ratified by the new Uniacke-Howe Government at the session of 1848. In June, Uniacke visited Montreal where a satisfactory arrangement was made with the Canadian Ministry. The post office came under provincial control in 1851.

With the establishment of full responsible government, the provincial administrations continued to negotiate with each other on problems of common interest. In 1848 two of the Nova Scotia ministers, Michael Tobin and George R. Young, came to Montreal to discuss matters of trade and transportation. The two executives were mutually pleased with each other and transacted considerable business.⁶⁰ Grey was delighted and looked forward to a speedy abolition of all interprovincial trade barriers.

The repeal of the British Corn Laws lost to the provinces their most valued market. In return they were given the power to amend their own tariffs. In 1847 the Canadian Government established a uniform tariff of 7½ per cent. The LaFontaine-Baldwin Ministry sought to obtain reciprocity with the United States and the repeal of the Navigation

⁵⁶"Howe-Buller Correspondence," 323, Howe to Buller, Sept. 2, 1847.

⁵⁷*Ibid.*

⁵⁸*Elgin-Grey Papers*, I, 74, Elgin to Grey, Oct. 13, 1847.

⁵⁹*Journals of the Nova Scotia Assembly*, 1847; *Journals of the Nova Scotia Assembly*, 1848, Appendix 56; William Smith, *History of the Post Office in British North America* (Cambridge, 1920), 267-9; *Novascotian*, June 19, 1848; *Journals of the Nova Scotia Assembly*, Appendix 56; *Journals of the Assembly of Canada*, 1849, BBB.

⁶⁰*Elgin-Grey Papers*, I, 181-3, Elgin to Grey, June 15, 1848. *Novascotian*, June 19, 1848.

Acts. In Nova Scotia the Uniacke-Howe Government was anxious to promote interprovincial trade. The Assembly of 1847 made the first move by passing an act to permit the free entry into Nova Scotia of all goods, except spirituous liquors, from any province offering similar concessions.⁶¹ The Uniacke-Howe Ministry not only repeated the offer, but urged its adoption by Canada and New Brunswick. Both provinces responded, and in a short time interprovincial free trade became a reality.⁶² The *Novascotian* rejoiced at the accomplishment, and looked forward hopefully to a new era. Grey too expressed satisfaction. He did not live to see the federal union and the railroad he so much desired, but something had been accomplished, and in his dreams he may have caught a glimpse of the Canada of 1948.

DISCUSSION

Mr. Underhill pointed out that 1948 was the centenary of that year of revolutions, 1848. He did not propose to criticize the heroes of 1848—for men like Howe, Baldwin, and LaFontaine may be regarded as the heroes of 1848 in this country—but at the same time he felt it only fair to say something on behalf of Papineau and Mackenzie. Too often these men are regarded simply as obstinate fools who refused to see the light of “responsible government.” Papineau and Mackenzie had, however, striven for democracy in a sense that Baldwin and LaFontaine never understood. Responsible government was a victory for the gentleman, not for the backwoods farmer. The Grit movement and other radical movements owed their origin to the fact that the form of government established in 1848 had not wholly met the particular needs of the time. Accordingly, when commemorating the memory of the heroes of 1848 we should not ignore the memory of the radicals who preceded them.

Mr. Rothney expressed pleasure that the programme committee should have seen fit to devote a session of the annual meeting to the hundredth anniversary of 1848. Elsewhere in Canada this centenary had passed practically unnoticed; no reference to 1848 had been made in the parliament of Canada. Indeed the only evidence of interest in the events of 1848 which had come to his attention was a small floral tribute on the monument of Baldwin and LaFontaine from the school children of Montreal. He went on to say that LaFontaine deserves to be regarded as our first Canadian premier; and yet there is no satisfactory biography of him. Would it be too much to hope that Father Jensen's paper might lead to such a biography? He agreed with Professor Underhill that Papineau had a deeper sense of democracy than LaFontaine. The struggle of 1848 had been one between liberals and conservatives, yet LaFontaine, despite his contribution to responsible government, was essentially conservative in outlook. Indeed, his successor, Morin, had led the French Canadians into alliance with that arch-Tory, MacNab. Referring to Quebec politics at the present time he expressed concern that M. Duplessis should be judged, as Papineau had

⁶¹Harold Innis and Arthur Lower, *Select Documents in Canadian Economic History* (Toronto, 1933), 366.

⁶²*Novascotian*, May 15, 1848. New Brunswick ratified the proposal on May 6.

been so often judged, by what his opponents say about him. Nationalism in Quebec—and this he considered to be as true of the present as of the past—was fundamentally democratic in its conception.

Mr. Sissons commented upon the part played by Hincks in the political education of LaFontaine. Hincks was a man with a greater realistic approach to politics than either Baldwin or LaFontaine. More than any other man he knew what Canada needed at that time. *Mr. Sissons* said that to some responsible government amounted to little more than the transfer of patronage from one party to another with little evidence to show that the Reformers were wiser in their use of it than their predecessors had been. But responsible government, to him, involved something more than this; it involved the transfer of power from a narrow oligarchy to a party with a wider basis among the population. In this transfer Hincks would seem to deserve a larger place than is usually accorded him.

Mr. Masters said that, although he had found the papers on 1848 interesting, he was inclined to feel rather tired of the subject of responsible government. Grade school and university had placed great emphasis upon responsible government in all courses in Canadian history; but it was a conception which was hard for the younger mind to understand and, in his opinion, this overdose of responsible government was one reason for the prevailing view among undergraduates that Canadian history is dull stuff. He is prepared to admit that responsible government was one of the great contributions to the political and constitutional development of Canada; nevertheless history, like women's hats, has its fads and fashions. Responsible government was at one time the fashionable subject of study in this country; but the present generation lacks the same interest in and zest for it displayed by the older generation of students and historians in Canada.

Mr. Underhill concluded the discussion by commenting upon the lack of controversy among Canadians over the events of 1848. In this respect Canada provides a great contrast to the countries of Europe.

BRITISH COLUMBIA'S AMERICAN HERITAGE

By WILLARD E. IRELAND

Provincial Library and Archives, Victoria, B.C.

ONE of the most interesting anomalies in the history of British Columbia arises from the fact that the strongest single impellant in the creation of what eventually became Canada's Pacific province was the fear of American expansionist tendencies west of the Rocky Mountains and yet that tendency, although established in fact by population movements, never seriously transferred itself into the arena of practical politics.

The role of American expansionism in the evolution of the physical boundaries of British Columbia is relatively easy to demonstrate. When the boundary line between British and American territory in the Pacific Northwest was defined by treaty in June, 1846, north of the forty-ninth parallel there was no organized British settlement, only a few widely dispersed parts of the fur-trading monopoly—the Hudson's Bay Company. That the Colonial Office was fully cognizant of the serious implications of this situation is demonstrated by a *minute* written by the colonial secretary, Lord Grey, on September 10, 1846. "Looking to the encroaching spirit of the U.S. I think it is of importance to strengthen the B[ritis]h hold upon the territory now assigned to us by encouraging the settlement upon it of B[ritis]h subjects. . . ."¹ Moreover, His Lordship was convinced that any colonization scheme could only be carried out effectively by the Hudson's Bay Company and, in consequence, despite tremendous opposition from "colonial reformers" and "Little Englanders" alike, the Crown Colony of Vancouver Island came into being under the terms of the royal grant of January 13, 1849. The subsequent history of the Company's trusteeship is not pertinent to this discussion, but the threat of American expansion, whether real or imagined, had resulted in more concrete efforts to safeguard British sovereignty.

Nor was this activity long to remain confined merely to Vancouver Island, for shortly thereafter rumours of gold discoveries in the Queen Charlotte archipelago aroused the interest of American adventurers who laid plans to investigate the new finds. Governor Douglas was convinced that if their gold seeking should prove successful, American colonization would follow and that they would seek "to establish an independent government until by force or fraud they became annexed to the United States."² While, in reality, his fears proved to be unfounded, nevertheless, they carried sufficient weight with the Colonial Office to result in his appointment as lieutenant-governor of Queen Charlotte Islands, thus bringing the region within the orbit of a regularly constituted colonial jurisdiction.

The Queen Charlotte Islands incident at least gave some forewarning of situations that were to develop when the great rush to the Fraser River developed in the spring and summer of 1858. It is not necessary here to detail the origin and progress of that rush, the effects of which were almost as serious and perturbing for San Francisco as for Victoria. According to

¹Public Record Office, C. O. 305, vol. 1, Minute, Sept. 10, 1846, on Pelly to Grey, Sept. 7, 1846.

²C. O. 305, vol. 3, Douglas to Grey, Jan. 29, 1852, printed in *Parliamentary Papers, House of Commons*, 788 of 1853, 2.

the San Francisco *Alta California* of June 5, 1858, "throughout the entire length and breadth of the State the 'Frazer river fever' " had seized the people and threatened "to break up, or at least, seriously disarrange for the time being the entire mining business of the State."³ Victoria itself was completely transformed and became, in effect, San Francisco in miniature. Of the thousands of persons joining the exodus from California, many had no inclination to embark on the hazards of mining on the bars of the Fraser. Artisans, clerks, professional and business men—in fact a representative cross section of society—joined in the rush and many hoped to pursue in Victoria their customary occupation. Merchants moved in "lock, stock and barrel." Indeed the old iron storefronts still to be seen on Wharf Street in Victoria bear mute testimony to the completeness of the transfer.

Needless to say numerous indications of the so-called Americanization of Victoria could be cited but only a few will be mentioned in passing. On June 25, 1858, the first issue of the *Victoria Gazette* made its appearance. This newspaper, the first to be published in British territory west of the Great Lakes, was owned by James Towne and Company of San Francisco and edited by H. C. Williston and C. Bartlett, prominent San Franciscan newspaper men. It was an excellent publication and not until the establishment of the *British Colonist* in December, 1858, by the former Nova Scotian, Amor de Cosmos, did it encounter any real competition and even this did not in any way impair its popularity. The sudden demise of this newspaper in November, 1859, is significant to this discussion. Despite the heavy preponderance of the newer elements in the population of Victoria in dealing with local political issues, this newspaper, though not averse to criticism of Governor Douglas, had, on the whole, maintained a scrupulously neutral position. Its collapse was swift and complete when it abandoned that policy and began to express what might be called the American point of view. Apparently in Victoria at this time American sentiment was neither sufficiently strong nor interested to sustain a well-established mouthpiece. Throughout the gold-rush period, however, it is important to remember that although the original British population was submerged by the great immigration of 1858, the administration of the government continued to remain firmly in the control of pre-gold-rush British officials.

It is perfectly true that key American public holidays were usually celebrated with as complete gusto in Victoria as in communities down the Sound but British holidays were also commemorated with equal fervour by all elements of the community. The establishment and development of the fire companies in Victoria is perhaps one of the best illustrations of the imprinting of the American pattern upon a British base. Governor Douglas had planned a fire brigade acting under the jurisdiction of the police, but public sentiment swept this aside and brought into being independent volunteer brigades, manned more often than not by men with long experience in the fire companies of San Francisco and using equipment procured from that city. So firmly entrenched did this system become that in 1879 when the city contemplated taking over the companies they refused to consider such a transfer of their equipment and it was not until 1886 that a civic-paid fire department came into existence.⁴

³San Francisco *Alta California*, June 5, 1858.

⁴For details see F. W. Laing and W. Kaye Lamb, "The Fire Companies of Old Victoria" (*British Columbia Historical Quarterly*, X, 1946, 43-75).

Still another indication of the infiltration of American sentiment into the structure of colonial life is to be found in the history of the Masonic order. The first lodges were organized under warrant of the Grand Lodge of England but the work practised by these lodges was unfamiliar to the many Masons arriving in the colony. In consequence an agitation arose for the organization of a lodge using American work and a dispensation from the Grand Lodge of Washington was sought. This plan was abandoned and in the end warrants were secured under the Grand Lodge of Scotland the work of which was more similar to that of American lodges. Indeed by 1871 there were five lodges operating under the Scottish and only four under the English constitution.⁵

In the main such examples of Americanization are probably more obvious and superficial than significant. There is one aspect of the gold-rush, however, that is all too frequently ignored. It is true that Governor Douglas was overwhelmed by the rush of newcomers and wrote to the Colonial Office in May, 1858:

. . . if the country be thrown open to indiscriminate immigration the interests of the Empire may suffer from the introduction of a foreign population, whose sympathies may be decidedly anti-British.

Taking that view of the question it assumes an alarming aspect, and suggests a doubt as to the policy of permitting the free entrance of foreigners into the British territory for residence without in the first place requiring them to take the oath of allegiance and otherwise to give such security for their conduct as the Government of the country may deem it proper and necessary to require at their hands.⁶

But in that same despatch Douglas took some pains to analyse the passenger list of the American steamer *Commodore* which had arrived on April 25 with 450 on board, 400 of whom went to the gold fields. Douglas reported: "About 60 British subjects, with an equal number of native born Americans, the rest being chiefly Germans, with a smaller proportion of Frenchmen and Italians, composed this body of adventurers."⁷ Whether or not this particular group can be considered representative of the whole gold-rush immigration, it is impossible to say, but at least it gives some foundation to the contention that the British element in the population of the colony was strengthened at least to a degree by the rush. In addition many individual cases could be cited of British subjects having followed the lure of gold through California and Australia only to seek and find permanent residence in British Columbia and Vancouver Island.

In addition it is obvious that Douglas realized the essential difference between previous population pressure from the south and that resulting from the gold-rush. He had witnessed at first hand the flood of immigration that burst through the Rocky Mountains in the early eighteen-forties to populate Old Oregon and put an end to the monopoly of the Hudson's Bay Company. This immigration was composed mainly of families whose roots ran deep into the soil of American civilization as found on the Atlantic

⁵For details see Willard E. Ireland, "A Further Note on the Annexation Petition of 1869" (*British Columbia Historical Quarterly*, V, 1941, 69-72).

⁶Douglas to Labouchere, May 8, 1858, MS, Archives of British Columbia, printed in cmd 2398, *Correspondence Relative to the Discovery of Gold in the Fraser's River District, in British North America* (London, 1858), 13.

⁷*Ibid.*

seaboard. It was but a part of the amazing westward advance of the agricultural frontier which was at once dangerous because of its tremendous driving power and its deep-rooted appreciation of the pattern of American life. In 1858, however, Douglas realized that the gold-rush was not a repetition, and consequently he took care to differentiate between "native born Americans" and that complex mass that seems inevitably to form the population of a gold camp. No longer does he stress the fear of a pro-American sentiment but rather of the "anti-British."

Up to this point attention has been concentrated mainly on conditions in Victoria, but what of the situation on the mainland where the gold fields were located. If there has been a "critical period" in the history of British Columbia it surely must have been during the greater part of 1858 when large numbers of foreign miners and others were located on the bars of the Fraser River at a time when no legally constituted authority existed on the mainland. The original regulatory "proclamation" issued by Governor Douglas had, in effect, no validity for his commission as Governor did not run on the mainland. How then did it come to pass that the mob violence which disgraced the California gold regions finds no repetition in British territory although often even the same personnel were present?

For one thing mining on the bars of the Fraser was a more hazardous undertaking and the delay involved in waiting for the high water to recede discouraged many of the "hangers on" who never did reach the gold fields. It is true that in American newspapers "Manifest Destiny" propaganda was rampant. The sentiment expressed in the following jingle printed in the *Washington Pioneer and Democrat* is typical.

Up above, among the mountains,
Men have found the golden fountains;
Seen where they flow! Oh joy transcendent!
Down, down, in noiseless streams transplendent,
Then, hurrah, and set your riggings—
Sail above, to richer diggings.

When news gets where Buch and Cass is,
Johnny Bull can go where grass is,—
He may rave and rant to foaming,
It will never stop our coming.
Then, hurrah, nor wait for papers,
The license men may cut their capers.

Soon our banner will be streaming,
Soon the eagle will be screaming,
And the lion—see it cowers,
Hurrah, bosy, the river's ours.
Then, hurrah, nor wait for calling,
For the Frazer's river's falling.⁸

But in the mines the situation was different. It was generally recognized that the regulations laid down by Douglas were restrictive but not discriminatory. There was no foreign licence fee such as had been required in California. Everyone came under the same licensing system and in conse-

⁸Olympia *Pioneer and Democrat*, Nov. 5, 1858.

quence the many foreigners involved in the rush soon came to realize in practice the meaning of fair play, and as a result there was less unrest and agitation. Likewise, Douglas never allowed a situation to get out of hand, nor did he allow the law to be overridden. This is possibly best indicated in his method of dealing with the attempt of local groups of miners to set up their own regulations sometimes in conflict with the general law. Douglas was willing to compromise within certain limits, as for example by increasing the size of claims. Moreover, he recognized the latent desire and ability for some local government in his creation of local mining boards under a gold commissioner but he firmly insisted that their activities be confined to improving conditions in the gold fields and not maintaining law and order. Once constitutional authority was established in November, 1858, and with the advent of a judge like Matthew Baillie Begbie, all elements in the population came to have a healthy respect for British justice and realized that there was no necessity for the "six shooter," the bowie knife, the vigilantes, or the posse in British Columbia.

With the decline of the gold excitement and the accompanying trade depression there was naturally much heart searching as to the future prospects of the colonies. Consolidation might be carried out; but would a united colony of British Columbia be in any relatively stronger condition? Subsequent history of the union did not engender much optimism. Canadian Confederation was being consummated in the East. What was the prospect of British Columbia's participation therein? Was annexation to the United States either feasible or desirable? Much has been written on the annexation movement in British Columbia and in the main its significance has been overplayed.⁹ It was primarily an expression of economic discontent and in that respect merits much the same interpretation as the parallel agitation in Montreal twenty years earlier. Within the colony it had a very precarious base for the leaders were for the most part not Americans but foreign born, and it was confined almost entirely to Victoria for there is no evidence of a parallel movement on the mainland nor even elsewhere on the island.

Annexation was from the beginning a forlorn hope. The British government had endorsed the federation plan and was astute enough to recognize that an annexation movement had high propaganda value as a means of plundering the imperial treasury. Canada was willing, if not able, to see Confederation extended, and within the colony there was a considerable and active group supporting Confederation, although admittedly from a variety of motives. The *Victoria British Colonist* summed up the situation tersely, as follows: "Knowing, as we do, that annexation is impossible, even if it were desirable, and that Confederation is inevitable, even if it were undesirable would not all of us be more profitably employed in seeking to secure the best possible terms for the Colony as a province of the Dominion?"¹⁰ It is curious that despite the large American and foreign element in the population of British Columbia in the late sixties

⁹On this point see W. N. Sage, "The Annexationist Movement in British Columbia" (*Transactions of the Royal Society of Canada*, 3rd series, XXI, sec. ii, 1927, 97-110); Hugh L. Keenleyside, "British Columbia—Annexation or Confederation" (*Canadian Historical Association Report*, 1928, 34-40); and Willard E. Ireland, "The Annexation Petition of 1869" (*British Columbia Historical Quarterly*, IV, 1940, 267-87).

¹⁰*British Colonist*, Nov. 20, 1869.

and seventies, politically it was neither active nor vocal. In consequence there has been no political heritage. Even events such as the purchase of Alaska and the Alabama claims failed to arouse any great attention in the colony. The only newspaper to advocate annexation was short-lived.¹¹ There was no semblance of a party or group nor any leadership, which was certainly not the case for the supporters of Confederation or its opponents. Few, if any, references to annexation are to be found in the Confederation debate of 1870. Anti-confederation sentiment there was in abundance, but annexation was never the alternative. J. S. Helmcken forthrightly stated the province's case:

The sum of the interests of the inhabitants is the interest of the Colony. The people of this Colony have, generally speaking, no love for Canada; they care, as a rule, little or nothing about the creation of another Empire, Kingdom, or Republic; they have but little sentimentality, and care little about the distinction between the form of Government of Canada and the United States.

Therefore no union on account of love need be looked for. The only bond of union outside of force—and force the Dominion has not—will be material advantage of the country and the pecuniary benefit of the inhabitants. Love for Canada has to be acquired by the prosperity of the country, and from our children.¹²

Confederation was a question of terms, and the price Canada was prepared to pay was acceptable to the people of British Columbia. The fulfilment of the terms of union proved to be another story. On many occasions preceding the completion of the Canadian Pacific Railway the situation was often difficult and occasionally critical. But as a further indication of the absence of American political sentiment, in the numerous arguments and resolutions regarding fulfilment of the terms of union the right of secession was often discussed and once formally requested, but, as in colonial days, annexation was never put forward as the alternative. Newspapers in the United States might frequently misinterpret this state of affairs and indeed the imminent annexation of British Columbia was as widely heralded in 1883¹³ as it had been in 1869. But the true state of affairs was summed up editorially by the *Victoria Colonist*:

For many years, at stated periods, and generally during the tourist season, when the town is filled with strangers, principally citizens of the United States, the residents of Victoria have been met with the enquiry, "Is there any desire for annexation in this province?" Nine men out of every ten thus addressed, if they spoke the truth, have answered, "Scarcely any." The large majority of the people are not satisfied with Canadian rule. They feel that they have been treated badly; but however disaffected they may be towards the Dominion they would not consent to sever the connection with Great Britain.¹⁴

¹¹This was the *Victoria Evening News* which suspended publication in June, 1870 after a precarious existence of fourteen months.

¹²British Columbia, Legislative Council, *Debate on the Subject of Confederation with Canada* (Victoria, 1870), 5 (Mar. 9, 1870).

¹³As, for example, the dispatch of August 14, 1883 of a correspondent of the *Chicago Tribune* reprinted in the *Victoria Colonist*, Aug. 29, 1883. See also *New Westminster Mainland Guardian*, Sept. 12, 1883.

¹⁴*British Colonist*, Sept. 25, 1883.

Indeed on this particular occasion annexation sentiment may be said to have swung full circle. The premier, Mr. William Smithe, availed himself of the opportunity presented by an after-luncheon speech to the journalists touring with the Villard Northern Pacific Railway party, not only to deny flatly the existence within the province of annexationist sentiment but went on to suggest that the United States might not long remain united and that part of the State of Washington might become annexed to British Columbia.¹⁵

Of the three main strands in British Columbia's heritage—British, Canadian, and American—the American has been politically the least vocal and significant and yet perhaps in other ways it has left its impression.¹⁶

¹⁵*Ibid.*, Sept. 25, 1883, Oct. 10, 1883.

For the reaction of various American newspapers to this proposal see *Victoria Standard*, Oct. 1, 3, 8, 10, 1883.

¹⁶The standard history of British Columbia is E. O. S. Scholefield and F. W. Howay, *British Columbia* (4 vols., Vancouver, 1914). The more recent study, dealing more specifically with American inter-relations, is F. W. Howay, W. N. Sage, and H. F. Angus, *British Columbia and the United States* (Toronto and New Haven, 1942).

CANADA AND THE NEW BRITISH COLUMBIA

By MARGARET A. ORMSBY
The University of British Columbia

THE completion of railway communication between British Columbia and eastern Canada is often considered to mark the beginning of the absorption of the Province into the Dominion of Canada. The bonds of race, custom, and economic interest, it is true, were strengthened after 1885 as Canadian population and capital moved westward, but it should not be forgotten that integrating factors existed from the commencement of Canadian settlement on the Pacific coast. The political and social concepts of eastern Canada were transplanted to British Columbia by the first Canadian settlers, and by 1871 the sense of sharing a common nationality was sufficiently strong to offset the economic attraction of the United States and to break the direct political tie with England. In spite of strained relations between the provincial and the federal government following the entrance of the province into Confederation, Canadian sentiment among British Columbians was materially strengthened by the joint endeavour of Canadians from all parts of the Dominion to build the section of the national railway which lay within the province's limits.

Canadians at first formed a minority group in British Columbia.¹ Although their individuality attracted little notice in gold-mining days, their influence in the maintenance of law and order came to be appreciated as the colony developed. In a society where economic monopoly and governmental paternalism were being replaced by the competitive acquisition of wealth and by anarchical tendencies, Canadians upheld morality and respect for authority. They became permanent residents in the colonies, and the builders, if not the surveyors and planners, of New Westminster and the smaller towns of the Fraser Valley and Cariboo. They supplied the professional and other services required in a pioneer community. And they led the way in political reform; for, from an old colonial environment, they had transferred to a new, a deep resentment of political disqualification and its off-shoots, economic discrimination and social slighting.

Almost from the beginning of Canadian settlement in the late fifties and early sixties, there was a manifestation of democratic tendencies which had emerged earlier in older British North American colonies. As on the American and the Upper Canadian frontiers, in British Columbia, the backwoodsman, the small farmer, and the day labourer instinctively abhorred class privilege. The agitation for the recognition of the people's rights was led by Canadians who revived the old formula of autonomy, free lands, separation of church and state, and opportunity for unhampered economic activity. Their struggle for these ideals forms one of the chapters in the history of the evolution of democratic institutions on this continent.

Change was already in the air when Canadian settlement commenced in the British colonies on the Pacific coast. In the older colony of Vancouver

¹The number of miners who came from California to the Fraser River mines in 1858 is variously estimated at 20,000, 25,000 and 30,000. Britishers were among those who came, but no contemporary reference is made to Canadians. For information concerning overland expeditions from Canada, see M. S. Wade, *The Overlanders of '62* (Archives of British Columbia, Memoir IX, Victoria, 1931), 2-7.

Island, British colonists had just succeeded in helping to persuade the British government to end the liaison between colonial administrators and Hudson's Bay Company officers. The colony's system of government was to be modernized so that control would be exercised directly by the Crown, and the sponsorship of the Hudson's Bay Company ended. The attention of the British authorities had been called to various grievances: the division of the governor's attention between governmental and Company affairs, nepotism in the filling of offices, the executive's irresponsibility, the high property qualification for office-holding, and the deterrent to settlement in the high price of crown lands. The curbing of the Company's power, which the imperial government proposed as a method of redress, was not wholly satisfactory to the British colonists, or to the Canadians who began to arrive in 1858 and 1859. Although such action implied that settlers would enjoy greater economic freedom, it did not necessarily mean that the people's power in government would be increased. Only fully representative and responsible government would give political freedom.

In the colony of British Columbia, organized on the mainland after the discovery of gold on the bars of the Fraser in 1858, conditions were still less satisfactory. Imperial considerations, and the expense involved in sending a military force to protect and police the gold colony and to assist in the development of its resources, necessitated a plan for the economical management of its affairs. On condition that he sever his connection with the Hudson's Bay Company, James Douglas, governor of Vancouver Island, was offered the dual position of governor of the two colonies. Convinced that gold-miners were not qualified by experience or by temperament for office-holding, Douglas delayed fulfilling his instructions to set up an assembly on the mainland, and appointed officials as members of an executive council. The colonists of British Columbia resented their exclusion from government, the colony's lack of a separate governor, and the residence of officials in Victoria. For five years they battled to obtain recognition of their rights, only to find in 1863, when the separate existence of the mainland colony was acknowledged, and a legislative council set up, that the people's representatives could be checked by the relatively superior strength of the official element and the exercise of authority by the new governor.

Three years later, as depression spread in the colonies and retrenchment became necessary, the imperial authorities decided to unite the colonies, extend the jurisdiction of the executive and legislature of British Columbia over the Island, and abolish Vancouver Island's assembly. Union satisfied neither islander nor mainlander. As might have been expected, there were disputes about the location of the capital, the amount of representation allowed to each section in the council, and the unequal debt-load which the united colony assumed from the two colonies. There was, too, the inevitable bickering about the burden of taxation and the distribution of government monies. One school of thought in Victoria favoured the demand for "the immediate restitution of our political rights, with full measure of responsible government" or permission from the British authorities for the colony to become annexed to the United States.² Another group of colonists felt that the suggestion of annexation was a counsel of despair, and that British

²Resolution of a meeting called by Leonard McClure in Victoria, Sept., 1866, as reported in the *Colonist*, Sept. 29, 1866.

Columbia's merging in a union of eastern Canadian colonies would be the best means of obtaining popular government and economic salvation.³ In the year 1866 the first attempt was made to obtain permission from the Colonial Office for recognition of British Columbia's right to be admitted into Confederation.⁴ At this time the British North America Act was before the imperial parliament. Obstacles, such as the Hudson's Bay Company's control of territory intervening between British Columbia and the Upper Canada, and Governor Seymour's lack of enthusiasm for union, prevented the immediate materialization of the plan for union.

Meanwhile, journalist agitators aroused interest in the establishment of self-government in British Columbia. They loudly denounced the political iniquities of the local administration, hoping to bring about reform through the education of opinion and indoctrination of the general public. It was to be reform through evolution; militant radicalism was impossible in a colony where there was a racial mixture and where a great many of the settlers were politically uninformed. The gold-miners tended to be strong individualists, living from day to day, and becoming so discouraged by hardship that many of them left the country.⁵ Speculators in lands and mines were more concerned with making quick profits than in combining efforts for the building of a stable society. Only those who had a real stake in the country, the farmers, the merchants, the traders, and the wage-earners who hoped to improve their condition, were seriously concerned about a more equitable distribution of political power.

The most serious problem facing the reformers was that of uniting classes and racial elements. British officials on Vancouver Island did not relish the prospect of premature retirement from their posts.⁶ Victoria also contained an influential group of Britishers who were active or retired Hudson's Bay men, and who enjoyed an indirect voice in colonial government. They, too, were not anxious for change. In addition, a merchant class of Germans and Jews in Victoria had business connections with San Francisco and thought in terms of possible annexation of the colony to the United States.⁷ Population was even more mixed on the mainland. There, a conservative British element, composed partly of officers and men retired from the Royal Engineers was satisfied with keeping the *status quo*,

³The question of Confederation was debated in the first meeting of the legislature of the united colony and unanimously approved. *Journals of the Legislative Council of British Columbia* (New Westminster, 1867), 72.

⁴This request was either mislaid or not sent. Seymour again communicated with the Colonial Office on September 24, 1867. F. W. Howay in his article, "The Attitude of Governor Seymour towards Confederation" (*Transactions of the Royal Society of Canada*, 3rd series, XIV, sec. ii, 1921, 31-51) contends that Seymour was unfriendly to the plan. After a Confederation League was formed in Victoria in May, 1868, branches were set up in New Westminster, Yale, and Lytton. A rally at Yale in September, 1868, has been referred to as "British Columbia's counterpart of the Charlottetown and Quebec Conferences," Walter N. Sage, "Amor de Cosmos, Journalist and Politician" *British Columbia Historical Quarterly*, VIII, July, 1944, 196).

⁵S. D. Clark, *The Social Development of Canada* (Toronto, 1942), 309.

⁶Lisgar wrote to Kimberley on April 27, 1871, that special consideration should be given to the subject of pensions, since "it had been distinctly understood on all sides that it would be very difficult to obtain the assent of British Columbia to the proposed terms of Confederation unless satisfactory assurances were given in reference to the question . . ." (Public Archives of Canada, G 365, no. 96).

⁷Willard E. Ireland, "The Annexation Petition of 1869" (*British Columbia Historical Quarterly*, IV, Oct., 1940, 281).

while Irish and Scots who desired increased prestige, were inclined to favour the Canadian cause. A group of European settlers, Germans, Austrians, Frenchmen, and others, lacked interest in local political issues and failed to throw weight behind the reform movement. This was also true of the French Canadians who were isolated socially and given little encouragement to take part in political life. The large Chinese element remained completely segregated from other groups. It was therefore difficult to obtain identity of interests. The only two groups sharing the same political tradition were the English and the Canadians. Many of the former considered their residence in the colony as constituting an interlude in a professional career, and, like Judge Matthew Baillie Begbie, continued to think of England "as if it were just outside the door."⁸ Some of them might have been willing to support the reform movement, had they not, with some justice, suspected Canadian leaders of underlying ambitions to hold office.

The sparse settlement of British Columbia also made for difficulty in getting concerted action. In Cariboo, the mobility of population caused fluctuation in the size of the towns. New Westminster, which had the greatest aggregation of reformers, was distant from Cariboo, as well as from the new mining areas in the Okanagan and the boundary country. It was also tied by proximity and by economic bonds to the agricultural districts of the lower mainland, where the agrarian element was not united in demands for governmental change. At Langley, where the Hudson's Bay Company had long been established, a group of farmers was nervous about the proposed inclusion of a demand for responsible government in the terms of union to be negotiated with Canada. In 1870, they expressed the opinion that:

Responsible Government at present would only enable the unscrupulous politicians of Victoria to plunder more effectually the interests of the Mainland, and impede the progress of the country generally.

The people of Langley cannot help believing that the past Government of this Colony has lent its influence in enabling the people to demand and obtain unjust concessions to the very great detriment of the other parts of the united colony and should any more of this foul treatment appear to be furthered, we shall do everything in our power in conjunction with the rest of the Mainland to rid ourselves of all connection with that part of the united colony known as Vancouver Island.⁹

As economic organization developed from the stage of private endeavour to joint enterprise, the reform movement gained momentum. By 1866, the tapping of the tremendous resources of the forests, mines, and rivers had commenced,¹⁰ and projects had been started which necessitated large-scale investment of capital as well as a labour supply. Neither the government nor the banks gave financial assistance to the promoters of these enterprises. After 1866, the burden of the government's indebtedness increased with each passing year. Both the Bank of British North America and the Bank

⁸Sydney G. Pettit, "Dear Sir Matthew: A Glimpse of Judge Begbie" (*British Columbia Historical Quarterly*, XI, Jan., 1947, 14).

⁹*Daily Standard* (Victoria), Dec. 1, 1870.

¹⁰See the articles by F. W. Howay, "Early Shipping in Burrard Inlet, 1863-1870" (*British Columbia Historical Quarterly*, I, Jan., 1937, 3-20); "Early Settlement on Burrard Inlet" (*ibid.*, I, Apr., 1937, 101-14); and "Coal-Mining on Burrard Inlet, 1865-1866" (*ibid.*, IV, Jan., 1940, 1-20); also the article by W. Kaye Lamb, "Early Lumbering on Vancouver Island, Part II, 1855-1866" (*ibid.*, II, Apr., 1938, 95-144).

of British Columbia followed extremely conservative policies, and were reluctant to make credit available either to the government or to individuals.¹¹ Lack of cheap land also hindered economic development. Until 1867 the Hudson's Bay Company retained sovereignty over crown lands on Vancouver Island,¹² and in many cases, sites which would have been favourable for centres of trade or new industries, formed part of the Company's holdings¹³ or were set aside as government reserves. In addition, the large areas in good farming districts which had been acquired by former Hudson's Bay men, were not subdivided. Many Canadians felt that the shift from an economy based on the staples of fur and gold to one based on coal-mining, lumber-milling, salmon-canning, and flour-milling, would result from political union with Canada. Only in this way, they thought, could capital and labour be imported, and a railway built. In anticipation of prosperity, some of them eagerly participated in speculative activities after 1871, investing their savings in lands near the probable route or terminus of the Canadian Pacific Railway.¹⁴

In addition to a desire for a greater voice in politics and for greater economic opportunity, Canadian reformers were motivated by antipathy for Englishmen. Knowing that many of the British officials and settlers belonged to the upper middle class or country gentry, Canadians often felt socially inferior in their presence. For the most part, the Canadians who emigrated to British Columbia were of the first generation born in Canada, and many of them had come from Ontario where they been raised on farms or in country parsonages or in the small-town homes of merchants and professional men. They lacked sophistication, and even the journalists, doctors, and lawyers among their number who took an active part in political life, were not always admitted to the closed social circle the Englishmen had created.

To a certain extent, the British element constituted an aristocracy of wealth and talents. In addition to economic security, arising from sound investment in land or guaranteed income from office, it had a feeling of cultural superiority. Many of the British settlers cultivated a taste for the arts and for letters, and carried on scientific investigations.¹⁵ They still read *The Times* and ignored colonial newspapers; and they published their

¹¹See R. N. Beattie, "Banking in Colonial British Columbia" (M.A. Thesis, Department of History, University of British Columbia, 1939), for a discussion of banking policies during the colonial period.

¹²Leonard A. Wrinch, "Land Policy of the Colony of Vancouver Island, 1849-1866" (M.A. Thesis, Department of History, University of British Columbia, 1932, 70).

¹³F. W. Laing, "Hudson's Bay Lands on the Mainland" (*British Columbia Historical Quarterly*, III, Apr., 1939, 75-101).

¹⁴De Cosmos held property at Bute Inlet, the route proposed for the railway if the island railway was built as part of the national railway system. Dr. Powell had holdings at Burrard Inlet to which he added after Vancouver was chosen as the terminus of the Canadian Pacific Railway.

¹⁵G. M. Sproat's anthropological work is discussed in T. A. Rickard's article, "Gilbert Malcolm Sproat" (*British Columbia Historical Quarterly*, I, Jan., 1937, 21-32); W. F. Tolmie's interest in botany is mentioned in S. F. Tolmie, "My Father: William Fraser Tolmie: 1812-1886" (*ibid.*, I, Oct., 1937, 225-40). Books written by Britishers describing living conditions in the colonies include the following: R. C. Mayne, *Four Years in British Columbia and Vancouver Island* (London, 1862); D. G. F. Macdonald, *British Columbia and Vancouver Island* (London, 1862); Matthew MacFie, *Vancouver Island and British Columbia* (London, 1865); J. D. Pemberton, *Facts and Figures Relating to Vancouver Island and British Columbia* (London, 1860).

literary works in England. Furthermore, on the fringe of the forest, and against the encroachment of the backwoodsman, they maintained the standards of polite society in Victorian England. In contrast, many of the Canadian settlers were young men who had not become established in professional or business careers when they left the East, and they still had little financial reserve. Those who turned to farming, usually had little education, and they knew only the social life of rural areas. Disinclination as well as the exigencies of frontier life with its lack of interchange of ideas, prevented their intellectual development.

At the same time, they did not relish the exclusion of friends and relatives from the professions. It was insulting to all Canadians, for example, to have Judge Begbie recommend the temporary granting of licences to Canadian barristers, "there being no English barristers or attornies [*sic*]", and it being "expedient to take the best that can be got."¹⁶ George A. Walkem, later premier of the province, who had been admitted to the bars of Upper and Lower Canada, had to wait until 1863, before Begbie would recognize his right to practise law. Such action convinced Canadians generally that the English "clique" was snobbish and tyrannical.

Diatribes in the press helped to widen the channel between Canadian and Englishman. Conscious that he "stood outside the Fort—the great Company,"¹⁷ Amor de Cosmos, a Nova Scotian who belonged to the Howe tradition, in the columns of the *Colonist* flayed Douglas during his governorship for lack of liberalism and for too great concern for the Hudson's Bay Company's business interests.¹⁸ After Douglas's retirement, de Cosmos took up the cause of representative and responsible government. On the mainland, de Cosmos's counterpart was John Robson, a reformer from Upper Canada who had a Wesleyan Methodist background and who edited the *British Columbian*. Robson's brush with Judge Begbie increased his antagonism for English officialdom, and probably for all Englishmen, and made him an energetic fighter for the introduction of a more popular element into the Legislative Council.¹⁹

In the latter phase of the colonial period, these two Canadian journalists poured forth political polemics and vituperative denunciation of the British oligarchy. Each of the editors had an excellent grasp of constitutional issues and a first-hand knowledge of local conditions, but neither of them had a great interest in political or economic theory. To a certain extent, they were both demagogues, and neither was unmindful of advantages which (once they had succeeded in securing British Columbia's entrance into Confederation) might accrue to himself. Temperamental differences and rivalry for attention made them political enemies. When in 1871, de Cosmos advocated the establishment of party government and the creation of a "Liberal" party,²⁰ he acted, according to Robson, "in the insane belief that he [de Cosmos] will be first Premier."²¹ In short order Robson called

¹⁶Sydney G. Pettit, "Judge Begbie in Action" (*British Columbia Historical Quarterly*, XI, Apr., 1947, 132).

¹⁷Beaumont Boggs, "What I Remember of Hon. Amor de Cosmos" (*British Columbia Historical Association, Fourth Report and Proceedings*, 1929, 58).

¹⁸W. N. Sage, "Amor de Cosmos, Journalist and Politician" (*British Columbia Historical Quarterly*, VIII, July, 1944, 189).

¹⁹Pettit, "Judge Begbie in Action," 134.

²⁰*Daily Standard*, July 19, 1871.

²¹*British Colonist*, July 18, 1871.

for a legislature of independents, working for the good of the country at large.²² Yet their combined efforts, and their conviction that change was necessary, made them important leaders of the reform movement in the period before 1871.

The influence of two medical men was also of considerable importance in the late colonial period. One of them was Dr. I. W. Powell, the son of a Canadian legislator²³ whose family sometimes had Macdonald's ear. A man of high principle, Powell was a sincere democrat. At the same time, too, he was not completely without interest in obtaining a federal appointment. The centre of his influence was Victoria. In the Cariboo, Dr. R. W. Carrall, a native of Woodstock, kept Macdonald informed about the progress of the Confederation movement, and carried out the prime minister's injunction to "keep the union fire alight until it burns over the whole Colony."²⁴ Carrall became one of the three British Columbia delegates who negotiated the terms of union and was rewarded for his efforts by being made one of British Columbia's first three senators.

Governor Musgrave indicated that he had some knowledge of the personal ambition of these men, when he wrote the colonial secretary, "The more prominent agitators for Confederation are a small knot of Canadians who hope that it may be possible to make fuller representative institutions and Responsible Government part of the new arrangements, and that they may so place themselves in positions of influence and emolument."²⁵ No doubt Macdonald relied on their private interests to help in the defeat of what he termed the conspiracy of "government officials, the Hudson's Bay agents and the Yankee adventurers"²⁶ to delay union. If he encouraged their ambitions, he had to pay the price later, for British Columbians hounded him for appointments.

In the end, external as well as internal pressure brought about British Columbia's entry into Confederation. By 1870, the imperial government lacked enthusiasm for continued support of an indigent and distant colony, which might be menaced by American expansionist activity in the Pacific. It encouraged the ambitions of the Canadian government to round out the national boundaries. For his part, Macdonald put "the screw on Vancouver Island,"²⁷ by arranging for the appointment of Governor Musgrave, who previously had worked for the cause of Confederation in Newfoundland. De Cosmos, a "western confederationist," had spent the summer of 1867 speaking in eastern Canadian cities in favour of British Columbia's union and on his return to the Colony he continued the fight. His work was supplemented by the efforts of John Robson, Dr. Carrall, Dr. Powell, Francis J. Barnard, and J. Spencer Thompson. Negotiations were conducted with Sir Georges Cartier in 1870 and an enlarged Legislative Council debated the terms of union in the spring of 1871. The generosity of treatment accorded British Columbia in fiscal arrangements, promise of railway communication, and freedom of choice in the setting up of responsible government and the

²²*Ibid.*, July 28, 1871.

²³B. A. McKelvie, "Lieutenant-Colonel Israel Wood Powell, M.D., C.M." (*British Columbia Historical Quarterly*, XI, Jan., 1947, 34).

²⁴P.A.C., Macdonald Papers, Letter Book 12, 367, Macdonald to Carrall, Jan. 5, 1869.

²⁵G 365, Musgrave to Granville, Oct. 30, 1869.

²⁶Macdonald Papers, Letter Book 12, 874, Macdonald to Musgrave, May 25, 1869.

²⁷*Ibid.*, 972, Macdonald to Sir John Young, May 25, 1869.

application of the Canadian tariff, carried the day for union. Provincial status was formally attained on July 20.

Already the prime minister was besieged by applications for appointments. Within a fortnight of British Columbia's entry into Confederation, Macdonald replied to a request from Dr. Carrall in these words:

I have your note of the 5th instant introducing Mr. Robson of the British Colonist. I have heard a good deal of Mr. Robson from Mr. Trutch and others as well as from yourself and shall be very glad to forward his views in any way in my power. The only difficulty will be the *modus operandi* as most of the important offices in the Province belong to the Provincial Government. We have only Post Offices, Customs, Excise to give, and are of course bound to retain the present office-holders in those Departments so long as they choose to remain & perform the duties efficiently. Still vacancies do occur occasionally, & I shall gladly keep Mr. Robson in mind. We think here that the Colonist deserves encouragement, and I have no doubt that a full share of any Government patronage there may be in that line will be extended to it. Mr. Langevin who visits British Columbia will see to that and other cognate matters.²⁸

Soon the prime minister had to consider Dr. Powell's request that he be made Indian commissioner. Powell had reminded him that "At present there is not a single Canadian official in B.C. and being Confederationists too from the first, to Canadians is mainly due the credit of finally carrying Union against both English and official influences."²⁹

Walkem was offended when the first federal appointment to the judiciary was given to John Hamilton Gray of New Brunswick, one of the Fathers of Canadian Confederation, who had been disappointed in his aspiration to become first speaker of the House at Ottawa. In pleading the case of Premier McCreight, Walkem but thinly disguised his own interest:

You have wounded our feelings by passing over Mr. McCreight . . . in the matter of the judgeship. I assure you that the murmur of displeasure has extended beyond our local Bar. What has a barrister to hope for in the future if he doesn't enter the H. of Commons? I have heard all you said to Carrall and De Cosmos on the subject and while admitting the justice of the bar principle involved, I sincerely regret in common with others that lesson No. 1 in Canadian politics reminds one too much of the taskmasters of Egypt. We all serve, but are to be treated like serfs—Downing St. earned for itself the most bitter animosity, simply because merit in this *quondam* Colony was overlooked & some empty-headed favourite wanted a place. The latter remark doesn't of course apply to Col. Gray who, I believe, is a good lawyer & most estimable man. In his appointment you simply ask us to overlook the slight to McCreight and accept the bon-bon that is offered or in other words to swallow a spoonful of honey with a quart of bad vinegar—and look pleased. I know there is no use grumbling. . . .³⁰ The following spring, although Walkem was a provincial cabinet mini-

²⁸*Ibid.*, Letter Book 16, 120-1, Macdonald to Carrall, July 31, 1871. Robson at this time was editor of the *Colonist*.

²⁹*Ibid.*, General Letters, 1871, 319, Powell to Macdonald, Sept. 8, 1871.

³⁰*Ibid.*, Macdonald-Walkem Correspondence, 5-6, Walkem to Macdonald, July 27, 1872.

ster, he tried to obtain the solicitorship at Victoria of the Canadian Pacific Railway.³¹ But Macdonald would only go as far as making him Queen's Counsel.³²

At least as long as dual representation lasted, de Cosmos appeared to be content with his role in public life, and did not press his suit on Macdonald.

As far as his relations with British Columbia were concerned, one of the prime minister's chief aims was not to single out favourites from either Canadian or British factions. His choice for the office of first lieutenant-governor of the province was Joseph W. Trutch, who was not sufficiently identified with the ruling caste of the colonial period to be anathema to Canadians, and not too friendly with Canadians to be objectionable to Englishmen. Trutch, a civil engineer, who had been commissioner of lands and works in the colonial government, would probably have preferred employment in a professional capacity, to service as an officer of the crown.³³ In any case, he had been one of British Columbia's delegates who had arranged the terms of union, and before their acceptance by the House of Commons, he had given a pledge that the province would be reasonable about the fulfilment of the railway commitment. For Macdonald, there were several advantages in having him in the post of lieutenant-governor. Trutch could be offered political tutoring since he did not understand the working of cabinet government; he had some influence with local politicians and could prevent them from being too wayward and headstrong; and he might induce the people of the province to adopt a reasonable attitude, if it were necessary to modify the terms of union. When Trutch chose as the first premier, John Foster McCreight, a Britisher who was not too close to the former oligarchy, Macdonald did not demur. It was possible that McCreight could be useful in uniting Canadian and British opinion.

So successful was Macdonald in winning popularity in British Columbia, and so general his support, that he was able by 1872 to use British Columbia as a pocket borough when Sir Francis Hincks was defeated in the election of that year. At that time, there was a strong desire in British Columbia for cabinet representation, so Trutch did not press the question of Hincks's eligibility under provincial regulations. Instead, he suggested to Macdonald that "if nothing is said on this point you can if you think fit make some adjustments at the opening of the next session."³⁴ Neither did Walkem adopt too critical an attitude. Complimenting Macdonald on Hincks's success. Walkem wrote:

³¹*Ibid.*, General Letters, 1877, 101, de Cosmos to Macdonald, Apr. 11, 1873.

³²*Ibid.*, Macdonald-Walkem Correspondence, Walkem to Macdonald Apr. 17, 1873, acknowledging the appointment.

³³*Ibid.*, Letter Book 19, 770, Macdonald to Trutch, Feb. 13, 1873, "As the Railway is to be built through the intervention of a Company, the Government will have nothing to do directly with the engineering. They will of course appoint an Inspector who will report on the progress of the work, and on whose certificate alone the subsidy in money or land will be granted. I do not suppose that such an appointment would in any way suit your views. I have gathered from you that your ambition is to be charged with the very interesting work of constructing the Railway through British Columbia and the Rocky Mountains. I have no doubt of being able, from my influence, with the Board to secure you this appointment and I have no little doubt that the remuneration will be fixed at a satisfactory rate."

³⁴*Ibid.*, Macdonald-Trutch Correspondence, 191, Trutch to Macdonald, Aug. 28, 1872.

I should have liked to have taken a hand in your election matters,
but in the language of Bret Harte,

In the game that ensued
We did not take a hand
But the cards they were strewn
Like leaves o'er the sand.

I should really like to tell you some good and original stories, but the silent language of a letter spoils them. Before I left, I heard many of yours, but as you are aware, the "faculty" is confined to the few. Order me, command me, give me an embassy in order that I may be one Hour in Ottawa. No pay *in coin*.³⁵

Six years later, in 1878, Macdonald himself was glad to accept a Victoria seat, after his defeat in Kingston.

By that time, the same standard of political ethics prevailed at Ottawa and Victoria. Patronage was expected to be the reward for loyalty, and provincial premiers liked to dispense largesse themselves. As premier, Walkem attempted to obtain control over the appointment of county court judges. To induce Macdonald not to stand in his way, he warned him that "an *opposition* member from this Province: could give you a great deal of annoyance on this & Railway expenditure."³⁶ Later, when the Liberals were in office at Ottawa and his relations with Mackenzie were far from friendly, Walkem tried in 1874 to obtain legislation giving the provincial government control over the placing of county court judges. It must have given Edward Blake, who had had other experience of Walkem's manoeuvring, considerable pleasure to be able to checkmate him through disallowance.³⁷

In the province's early years, both the strength and weakness of democracy were discernible. The secret ballot was introduced, and the franchise was extended to all but Indians and Chinese; but the spoils system existed, and the machinery of government worked slowly. There was inefficiency in government financing, and hints that prominent men were guilty of bribery and corruption. When British Columbia became a discontented province as the result of the slow prosecution of the railway project, negotiations for the settlement of differences were sometimes concluded abruptly, threats of secession were raised, as well as the first faint cries for "better terms." Mainland and Island interests continued to compete in pressing claims for the railway terminus, and learned their first lessons in lobbying. A crowd of hungry would-be politicians and their friends importuned Ottawa for government employment or contracts for railway construction. Political strategy in vogue in Ottawa, had its replica in Victoria.

Only in the failure to introduce party government did British Columbia depart from eastern practice. As Goldwin Smith observed, government appropriations were a more serious thing in British Columbia than party affiliations. Yet in the early seventies before the full implication of the loss of favour of the Conservative party at Ottawa was realized, there was some talk of drawing party lines. In 1873, Walkem told Macdonald that

³⁵*Ibid.*, Macdonald-Walkem Correspondence, 13, Walkem to Macdonald, Sept. 14, 1872.

³⁶*Ibid.*, 20, Walkem to Macdonald, Dec. 11, 1872.

³⁷Provincial Archives of British Columbia, Executive Document 29/75, Copy of a Report of a Committee of the Hon[ourable] the Privy Council, approved Oct. 16, 1875.

"a very strong *Grit* element has been transplanted from Ont: & taken root here,"³⁸ and Judge Gray considered de Cosmos "*a Grit in every pulsation of his heart*. McKenzie [*sic*] or Geo. Brown are no more thoroughly so."³⁹ After 1873, however, it would have meant political suicide for any leader in British Columbia if he had made open declaration of affiliation with the Liberal party of the east.

While political conformity between province and Dominion developed, cultural ties also grew stronger. By 1872 educational principles and practice in the Province, for example, were drawn in line with those in Ontario. During Douglas's governorship, common schools, supported by the government, but charging tuition, had been established on Vancouver Island.⁴⁰ Church schools and private schools had also made their appearance. The establishment of a system of free education was largely the work of Dr. Powell, who succeeded in obtaining an act in 1865 for the establishment of common schools on Vancouver Island. The "admirable system of Canada West" was the model for the first free non-sectarian school in Victoria established by John Jessop in 1864.⁴¹ Free education helped to break down class distinctions, and it was no longer necessary to provide separate schooling for what Douglas had termed "laborers' children."

Religious ties also developed between eastern and western communities. From the time of the arrival of the four pioneer Methodist missionaries in 1859, a strong Methodist thread ran through the fabric of early British Columbia history. Methodism, with its emphasis on temperance and honesty in business, was a reforming influence on the frontier, and did much to improve relations between white men and natives. It could be exclusive, as it was at Chilliwack, where at one time land purchase depended on religious conformity.⁴² Like Puritanism in the early New England colonies, it did not frown too much on the core of hard materialism to be found in many of the early settlers. New Westminster was the centre of the Methodist following. A city laid out by Royal Engineers, its spiritual as well as its political heritage was Canadian.

Apart from the Methodists, only the Roman Catholics had close affiliations with eastern Canadian centres. Roman Catholic influence was tremendously strong with the Indians as the result of proselytizing activities, and important where there were French and French-Canadian settlers. There were few Irish in the fold, however, for British Columbia's Irish element was chiefly Protestant.

Anglicanism was not too popular in the lower mainland where it was regarded as being the faith of the Englishman; and on the Island its strength was dissipated because of factional feuds.

Interest in the common man was expressed by provincial politicians as well as by federal leaders in the eighties. Most British Columbians at that

³⁸Macdonald Papers, Macdonald-Walkem Correspondence, 25, Walkem to Macdonald, Apr. 17, 1873.

³⁹*Ibid.*, General Letters, 1873, 60, J. H. Gray to Macdonald, Jan. 27, 1873.

⁴⁰D. L. MacLaurin, "Education before the Gold-Rush" (*British Columbia Historical Quarterly*, II, Oct., 1938, 248-9).

⁴¹George W. Spragge, "An Early Letter from Victoria, V.I." (*Canadian Historical Review*, XXIX, Mar., 1948, 55).

⁴²J. E. Gibbard, "Early History of the Fraser Valley, 1808-1885" (M.A. Thesis, Department of History, University of British Columbia, 1937, 244).

time would have accepted the measuring-rod adopted by J. B. Kerr later in assessing the worth of pioneer settlers: he "was very successful in his business, making a great deal of money."⁴³ For most British Columbians, as well as for most Canadians, the man of virtue was the successful farmer or business man. John Robson's early stand on the Oriental question, which is in such contrast to Douglas's liberal attitude when a negro colony on Vancouver Island was being planned, was thought by some, to spring from an interest in the lot of the working man.⁴⁴ Robson, however, was just as naive as John A. Macdonald, when it came to comprehension of the theory of class conflict. Scientific socialism was a field in which he could hardly claim to be a specialist. It was not until the industrial capitalist came to British Columbia in the nineties, that the craft union movement, which had started in 1862, marshalled its strength. Revolutionary socialism made its appearance in the early years of the twentieth century, gaining its support from the well-read British workingmen, coal-miners, and smelter-workers, who were the product of an intellectually more mature community than existed for native British Columbia workers.

Canadians who came to British Columbia between 1858 and 1885, were not theorists, but practical men of affairs, who had a deep respect for property and believed in the merit of hard physical work. They fought vigorously for constitutional reform, and expected benefit if it were accomplished; they knew that the maintenance of law and order was in their business interests; they introduced manners and standards of behaviour which they had known in the east; and they followed the social pattern they had known at home. Gradually they inched closer to British society, adopting some of its customs, and some of its outlook. Their enterprise and their energy gave to British Columbia, political, religious, and educational institutions which were Canadian. By the time of the completion of the trans-continental railroad, British Columbia was manifestly Canadian in spirit and custom.

As his last entry in his diary of the Confederation negotiations in 1870, Dr. Helmcken had written: "I am to tell from Sir George Cartier that it is necessary to be Anti-Yankee. That we have to oppose their damned system—that we can and will build up a northern power, which they cannot do with their principles, that the Govt. of Ontario, or rather of the Dominion is determined to do it."⁴⁵ Surely it was Dr. Helmcken, and not Cartier, who identified the government of Ontario with the government of the Dominion. As a product of the old colonial environment of Vancouver Island, Dr. Helmcken knew only too well the change that the "Ontario" men had made in government, as well as in the political and social life of British Columbia.

⁴³J. B. Kerr, *Biographical Dictionary of Well-Known British Columbians* (Vancouver, 1890).

⁴⁴Adam Shortt and Arthur G. Doughty, *Canada and Its Provinces* (Toronto, 1914), XXI, 253.

⁴⁵Willard E. Ireland, "Helmcken's Diary of the Confederation Negotiations, 1870" (*British Columbia Historical Quarterly*, IV, Apr., 1940, 128).

A BENT TWIG IN BRITISH COLUMBIA HISTORY

By W. KAYE LAMB
The University of British Columbia

SEVENTY-FIVE years ago this spring, on April 2, 1873, L. S. Huntington, M.P. for Shefford County, Quebec, rose in the House of Commons and made the charges that precipitated the celebrated Pacific Scandal. In November, Sir John A. Macdonald was forced to resign as prime minister and was succeeded by the Liberal leader, Alexander Mackenzie. This, in turn, precipitated a crisis in the relations between British Columbia and the Dominion of Canada. Even before Macdonald's resignation the province had been restive because of the delay in commencing the construction of the promised transcontinental railway, and Mackenzie's lack of enthusiasm for the project was well known. Within a month of taking office he referred publicly to the railway clause in the terms of union under which British Columbia had joined confederation in 1871 as "a bargain . . . made to be broken,"¹ and announced that he would negotiate for its modification. Early in 1874, in a letter to the emissary he was sending to British Columbia for this purpose, he described the granting of the railway clause as an "insane act" and contended that the province had "obtained on paper terms which at the time were known to be impossible of fulfilment."²

To British Columbians these were fighting words, for they threatened one of the two things that the people of the province considered they must secure if confederation were to be worth while. Railway communication with the East and a satisfactory financial settlement were the twin essentials; and if anyone doubts this, let him read the *verbatim* report of the lengthy debate on the whole confederation question that took place in the Legislative Council of the old crown colony in March, 1870. Many points were mentioned, but of them all those two stand out like mountain peaks.

The financial question was dealt with frankly and in most specific terms. Amor de Cosmos, for example, said in so many words that confederation "must have a money value"; and in his opinion the subsidies and other financial arrangements should be such as to yield the new province an annual surplus of \$200,000.³ "A change, without financial improvement, would," he was convinced, "destroy all hope of any such thing as the loyal and cordial co-operation of our people with the Government of the Dominion." Dr. Helmcken, at that time opposed to confederation because he did not think that sufficiently advantageous terms could be secured, expressed a similar opinion. "The people," said he, "must be better off under Confederation than alone, or they will not put up with it."⁴ "No union between this Colony and Canada can permanently exist, unless it be to the material and pecuniary advantage of this Colony to remain in the union."⁵

¹Speech at Sarnia, Nov. 25, 1873; see *Toronto Globe*, Nov. 26, 1873.

²*Message Relative to the Terms of Union with the Province of British Columbia* (Ottawa, 1875), 10. (Canada, Sessional Papers, 1875, no. 19.)

³British Columbia, Legislative Council, "Debate on the Subject of Confederation with Canada," reprinted from the *Government Gazette Extraordinary* of Mar., 1870 (Victoria, 1912), 57, 62.

⁴*Ibid.*, 11.

⁵*Ibid.*, 13.

The demand for a transcontinental railway arose from the obvious fact that union without easy communication and transportation would be no union at all, but it was linked closely with the financial provisions as well. Economically British Columbia was in the doldrums. Employment was declining in the gold fields, and other industries and agriculture were developing too slowly to make good the deficiency. Construction of a railway would entail the expenditure of many millions of dollars; it would bring to the colony the thing it needed most, namely, a large payroll. It would prime the pump in a lavish way, attract population, and accelerate the whole pace of economic life.

Frequently one hears it said that in 1870 British Columbia asked only for a wagon road, but was given a railroad instead by the Dominion. Actually this entirely misrepresents the facts. It is true that a road was mentioned, but its preliminary nature was made quite clear; a railroad was to follow. Even the draft terms discussed by the Legislative Council in March stipulated that work on the line was to commence within three years of the date of union, and thereafter at least a million dollars a year was to be expended "in actually constructing the initial sections of such Railway from the Seaboard of British Columbia, to connect with the Railway system of Canada."⁶ It is not going too far to say that the attitude of British Columbia could be summed up in the words: "No railroad no confederation." John Robson, amongst others, characterized it as "the most vital part of the whole scheme."⁷ Tyrerwhitt Drake insisted that it was "the condition in Hon. Members' minds upon which Confederation or no Confederation hangs."⁸ Helmcken's view was that "Without it Confederation must not take place."⁹

All this was fully realized in Ottawa. Indeed, the railway was as much a part of the Dominion's plan—or, at any rate, of Sir John A. Macdonald's plan—as it was British Columbia's. It is clear, for one thing, that Sir John felt that the maintenance of British sovereignty on the Pacific coast might well depend upon the railway. He was convinced that the Americans would do everything possible "short of war to get possession of the western territory." Only "immediate and vigorous steps" could prevent this, and one of the first essentials was "to show unmistakably our resolve to build the Pacific Railway."¹⁰ Helmcken's diary of the negotiations that took place in Ottawa in June, 1870, between the delegates from British Columbia and representatives of the Canadian government makes it clear that the railway clause was not something that was wrung from the Dominion. It seems to have been practically taken for granted. Helmcken's comment was: "They do not consider that they can hold the country without it."¹¹ This tallies with Macdonald's statement in the letter he wrote to the governor-general when the Pacific Scandal broke, three years later. Referring to the railway clause he explained that his administration had been "obliged to carry the measure, or to abandon all hope of the union with British Columbia. . . ."¹²

⁶*Ibid.*, 163.

⁸*Ibid.*, 85.

⁷*Ibid.*, 80.

⁹*Ibid.*, 81.

¹⁰Sir Joseph Pope (ed.), *Correspondence of Sir John Macdonald* (New York, 1921), 124-5. The words quoted are from a letter to C. F. Brydges dated Jan. 28, 1870.

¹¹Willard E. Ireland, "Helmcken's Diary of the Confederation Negotiations, 1870" (*British Columbia Historical Quarterly*, IV, 1940, 120).

¹²Joseph Pope, *Memoirs of the Right Honorable Sir John Alexander Macdonald* (Ottawa, 1894), II, 175.

The important change made in Ottawa was the adoption of a much more exacting building schedule. The time that might elapse before construction commenced was cut from three years to two, and the Dominion undertook to complete the line within ten years. Endless controversy has raged about the question as to whether or not this latter provision was intended to be taken literally. In retrospect it seems quite clear that it was added primarily as evidence that the Dominion proposed to push construction vigorously. The speech made in Ottawa by J. W. Trutch in April, 1871, two months before the terms of union took effect, would seem to decide the point. Trutch had been one of the delegates sent to Ottawa by British Columbia the previous year, and Helmcken's diary indicates that he had a major share in drafting the railway clause. Speaking "with special care" because he desired "that full weight should be given to every word," he explained the origin of the railway provisions at some length. The preliminary coach and wagon road for which British Columbia had asked had been ruled out as unnecessary because travel by that means was already out of date. In its place it was decided to substitute an estimate of the time it would take to build the railway, and ten years was agreed upon. Trutch continued: "If it had been put at twelve or fifteen years, British Columbia would have been just as well satisfied, and if the estimated period had been reduced to eight years she would scarcely have been better pleased; but some definite period for the completion of this work the British Columbia delegates insisted upon as a necessary safeguard to our colony in entering into the proposed union To argue that she expects it to be carried out in the exact interpretation of the words themselves, regardless of all consequences, is a fallacy that cannot bear the test of common sense."¹³

Turning back, with these facts in mind, to the years 1873 and 1874, we can appreciate better how British Columbia's expectations had been dashed since she had joined the Dominion. The financial provisions in the terms of union had not worked out as intended. The Dominion had assumed the colony's million dollar debt in 1871, and there had been a modest budget surplus at the end of that year. But in 1872, instead of having the hoped-for surplus of \$200,000, the province had a deficit of \$277,000. Drastic cuts in expenditure virtually balanced the budget in 1873, but thereafter deficits averaging more than \$250,000 a year were to be the order of the day. Equally disappointing was the fact that construction of the railway had not commenced. Even the surveys were not complete, and expenditure in British Columbia on the project over the seven-year period 1871-7 amounted to no more than \$1,300,000. The hoped-for payroll, like the hoped-for budget surplus, had proved illusory.

It must be stressed again that the two matters were closely linked. Helmcken's notes show that he and his fellow delegates regarded the railway clause as being to all intents and purposes one of the financial provisions of union, and they show, too, that great importance was attached to the fact that construction was to commence in *British Columbia*.

The reasons for the delay in starting work are not far to seek. The task of surveying the various alternative routes that were proposed was an immense one. To await completion of the work seemed reasonable; cer-

¹³*British Columbia and the Canadian Pacific Railway, Complimentary Dinner to the Hon. Mr. Trutch . . . (Montreal, 1871), 9.*

tainly it gave a very plausible excuse for delay. More important, perhaps, was the fact that the Macdonald Government had been forced to give an undertaking that construction of the railway would not increase taxation; to launch so vast an enterprise under this limitation was not easy. The Opposition were mostly of the opinion that the Dominion should never have undertaken to build a railway, and many of them felt that the project was beyond the country's financial ability. It was this latter point of view that Alexander Mackenzie expressed so bluntly when he came to power at the end of 1873.

Whatever the cause, the consequences of the failure to commence work on schedule were far-reaching. For a decade British Columbia was left in the politically dangerous position of being *in* Canada but in most respects not *of* it, and this was a condition that only a railway could cure. "Until this great work is completed," Macdonald wrote in 1878, "our Dominion is little more than a 'geographical expression.' We have as much interest in British Columbia as in Australia, and no more. The railway once finished, we become one great united country with a large inter-provincial trade, and a common interest."¹⁴

Amongst other things the failure to start construction on schedule greatly prolonged the controversy over the route that the railway should follow. To begin with there had been remarkable unanimity on the point in British Columbia, and the treatment of the subject during the debate in the Legislative Council in March, 1870, had been markedly free from sectionalism. H. P. P. Crease, the attorney-general, expressed the general opinion when he contended that "the Overland Railway must follow down the main artery of the Colony, Fraser River, and have its terminus either at New Westminster or Burrard Inlet."¹⁵ As an engineer, J. W. Trutch took the view that the point should be left in abeyance until surveys had been made, but even he went so far as to express the hope that the line would follow the Fraser, and to admit that the river was "the main artery and the probable course of the Railway."¹⁶ Amor de Cosmos, later to become so vigorous a champion of the Island railway, was at this time an equally vigorous champion of the Fraser. He pressed again and again for a line from Yale to the interior: "I never could see how British Columbia could be settled without a Railway to connect Fraser River with Kamloops. . . . I maintain that the true course for the development of the resources of the country is to make a line of Railway from some navigable spot on the Fraser to Lake Kamloops." This, he added, "might be regarded as a part of the transcontinental line."¹⁷

These views were sound, as subsequent events have shown; but unanimity on the point did not last for long. The business men in Victoria wakened up to the fact that the city's days as the wholesale and distributing centre of British Columbia would end quickly if the railway terminated on Burrard Inlet, and by the autumn of 1870 a campaign to bring the terminus to Vancouver Island was in full swing. The *Victoria Standard*, of which Amor de Cosmos was editor, was prominent in this agitation. "No terminus

¹⁴Pope, *Correspondence of Sir John Macdonald*, 240-1, Macdonald to Sir Stafford Northcote, May 1, 1878.

¹⁵*Debate on the Subject of Confederation*, 68.

¹⁶*Ibid.*, 70.

¹⁷*Ibid.*, 78-9; see also 83.

no confederation" was raised as an election cry, and public meetings endorsed a demand that an Island terminus should be specified in the terms of union.

This demand came to nothing, but the campaign continued, month by month and year by year. Controversy was encouraged by the grandiose scale of the railway surveys, which embraced virtually every river valley running to the sea. As it was obvious that Seymour Narrows was the only conceivable point at which bridges might be constructed which could carry the line to Vancouver Island, the Island railway champions supported the Bute Inlet route, which would bring the line to the coast in that general vicinity. In 1872 their hand was strengthened by the San Juan boundary award. Thereafter every ton of coal shipped by sea from the Nanaimo mines to the Esquimalt naval base was pictured as passing under the American batteries that were sure to be mounted on San Juan Island, and a railway between the two points was represented as being a strategic necessity. Ultimately they achieved a substantial measure of success, for in June, 1873, the Macdonald Government, faced with the Pacific Scandal and desperately in need of support, passed an order-in-council that designated Esquimalt as the terminus of the transcontinental line and stated further that the railway would be built northward to Seymour Narrows.

Victoria's position at this time was a well-entrenched one. Nearly half the white population of the whole province dwelt there, and the city's control of political and commercial activities was virtually absolute. The community was dominated by a closely-knit group of officials and first families whose roots were for the most part in Great Britain. Sentiment thus played little part in their attitude towards Canada. J. D. Edgar, the emissary Alexander Mackenzie sent to British Columbia in 1874, was struck by the unusual atmosphere of the city and in his report accounted for it as follows: "The circumstances of the early settlement of the Province gave it a population of peculiar intelligence; and the fact that most of the rougher kind of labor is performed by Chinamen or Indians, has afforded in an especial way to the people of Victoria, the Provincial Metropolis, leisure and opportunity for the fullest discussion of their great question of the day. Their keen intelligence and zeal in public affairs suggests a parallel in the history of some of the minor States of ancient Greece and Italy."¹⁸

Only a railway or railway construction on a generous scale could pour in goods and population in a volume sufficiently large to counterbalance the influence of the old crown colony clique, and, as it turned out, this took a good many years to accomplish. A quarter of a century passed before Vancouver surpassed Victoria in population, and the last of the old Victoria general wholesale houses, dating back to the days of the gold-rush, closed its doors only about ten years ago. All through the critical years of the seventies the policy of British Columbia towards the Dominion was thus dominated by the surviving crown colony clique in the capital city; and this circumstance was to leave a permanent mark on Dominion-provincial relations.

It is perhaps not unimportant to note that Victoria's position had been threatened for a time at an earlier date. In 1866 the old crown colony of Vancouver Island had been somewhat unceremoniously annexed to the

¹⁸*Message Relative to the Terms of Union with the Province of British Columbia* (Ottawa, 1875), 16.

mainland colony of British Columbia. Victoria's reaction may be judged by the oft-quoted note in the diary of the old colony's retired governor, Sir James Douglas: "The union of Vancouver's Island and British Columbia was proclaimed today. The ships of war fired a salute. It would have been more appropriate had they fired minute guns and held a funeral procession on the occasion of this sad and melancholy event." Annexation for a time cost Victoria its status as a capital, but within two years this was regained, thanks to astute behind-the-scenes activity in London.

There is no need to repeat here the familiar story of the Edgar mission, Premier Walkem's appeal to London, the Carnarvon Terms, and the visit of Lord Dufferin. The significant thing is to note that British Columbia's official reaction to the Dominion's failure to live up to the letter of the railway clause in the terms of union would have been more fitting to a crown colony than to a province. The government in Victoria did not yet look upon a "better terms" controversy as a family quarrel; it still retained an independent air, and considered itself in many respects still an outsider. It regarded the terms of union as a treaty, which the colony had been beguiled into signing by the imperial government. Failure to commence the railway constituted a treaty violation, and, remembering the imperial aspect, it was only natural that Walkem should turn to London for redress. From this same root arose the idea that British Columbia should have the right to leave the Dominion if the latter did not fulfil treaty terms to the letter. The transition from the cry of "No terminus no confederation" in 1870 to "The Carnarvon Terms or separation" agitation of 1876 is thus seen to have been an easy and natural one, and Amor de Cosmos's motion in the House of Commons in April, 1879, to provide for the peaceful separation of British Columbia simply carried the series to its logical conclusion.

It must be noted that this was essentially a Vancouver Island point of view; the reaction of the mainland to the situation was quite different. The attitude there was based on two convictions. The first of these was that the Fraser River was the natural gateway to the interior, and that it should and ultimately would be the route followed by the railway. The second was that if the terms of union proved impracticable, or if they were not being carried out, the thing to do was to bargain for a new settlement. The mainland never thought seriously of any alternative to confederation. Its leading citizens felt that British Columbia was in the Dominion to stay. They had confidence in its future and were prepared to work out their salvation within its framework.

The interesting thing is that Vancouver Island's tendency upon occasion to revert to the point of view of an outsider has shown itself to some degree upon many occasions since the eighteen-seventies. The crown colony attitude that circumstances caused to be carried over into the life of the province still lives on in a modest way. A trace of it has cropped up in the submissions prepared and the editorials published on virtually every one of the fourteen occasions upon which British Columbia raised the "better terms" issue between 1901 and 1938. The reaction of some people on the Island to conditions they deem unsatisfactory is still a desire to secede. No longer ago than 1935 a campaign was launched in the *Victoria Colonist* which had for its objective the detachment of Vancouver Island from the mainland of British Columbia. The case was carried right back to the annexation of 1866, from which all the Island's difficulties were alleged to

have sprung. The mainland was represented as a vampire that was sucking Vancouver Island dry of its natural resources, and much was made of the claim that the Island yielded a third of the province's revenues, while provincial expenditure there fell far below that proportion. The earlier articles in the series, which continued for the better part of a year, merely demanded a "new deal" for Vancouver Island, but the last of them came out forthrightly for independence and urged that Vancouver Island "go it alone."

For a time this campaign made some headway. The present writer was an inhabitant of the Parliament Buildings at the time, and he well remembers the mixture of mild excitement and milder anxiety with which it was greeted by the civil servants. Popular discussion quickly embroidered the scheme. Vancouver Island was to become, amongst other things, a holiday playground—a "Monte Carlo of the Pacific." The Parliament Buildings were to be transformed into a casino, and roulette tables were to be set up in the marble halls in which we are meeting this evening. Strange as it may now appear, it seemed for a fleeting moment as if the scheme for separation might conceivably come to something.

One thing is virtually certain. We have not seen the last of the proposal. As the twig was bent, so the tree, once the tallest in the forest, but now usually hidden in the shadow of greater neighbours, has grown, and will doubtless continue to grow.

DISCUSSION

There was no time for discussion but the President, *Mr. Soward*, said in closing the meeting that the three speakers, although their postgraduate work had been done at different institutions including Paris, London, and Bryn Mawr, had all received their undergraduate education at the University of British Columbia. Each owed his or her interest in British Columbia history to the work and inspiration of Dr. W. N. Sage, former president of the Canadian Historical Association and head of the Department of History, University of British Columbia, who had himself devoted so many years to the enrichment of our knowledge of the history of the Pacific Coast.

NATIONAL HISTORIC PARKS AND SITES

BY THE NATIONAL PARKS SERVICE, LANDS AND DEVELOPMENT
SERVICES BRANCH, DEPARTMENT OF MINES AND RESOURCES

THE National Parks Service is entrusted with the restoration, preservation, and administration of national historic parks and sites, and the commemoration of the public services of outstanding persons in Canadian history. The Service is advised in this phase of its work by the Historic Sites and Monuments Board of Canada, an honorary body of recognized historians, representing the various provinces of the Dominion.

The personnel of the Board is as follows: Chairman, Dr. J. Clarence Webster, Shediac, New Brunswick; Professor Fred Landon, London, Ontario; Professor D. C. Harvey, Halifax, Nova Scotia; the Honourable E. Fabre-Surveyer, Montreal, Quebec; J. A. Gregory, North Battleford, Saskatchewan; the Reverend Antoine d'Eschambault, St. Boniface, Manitoba; Major G. Lanctot, Dominion Archivist, Ottawa, Ontario; Professor M. H. Long, Edmonton, Alberta; Professor Walter N. Sage, Vancouver, British Columbia; W. D. Cromarty, National Parks Service, Ottawa, Ontario.

The annual meeting of the Board was held in Ottawa, May 21-3, 1947, when a wide variety of matters relating to the historic background of the Dominion were reviewed. Of the many sites that have been considered by the Board to date, 348 have been marked or acquired and 210 others recommended for attention at a later date.

NATIONAL HISTORIC PARKS

Fort Anne National Historic Park is situated in Annapolis Royal, Nova Scotia. The museum building, restored in 1935, was originally the Officers' Quarters and was built in 1797-8 under the supervision of Edward, Duke of Kent, the father of Queen Victoria, when he was commander-in-chief of the British Forces in North America with headquarters at Halifax, Nova Scotia.

Concrete mountings were made for the cannon on the northwest Curtain; shingle stain was applied to the roof and walls of the band stand; the exterior walls of the museum building were painted; a water sprinkling system was installed on the lawn of the fort square; all signs on the grounds were repainted, the driveway and paths were raked and levelled, the tablets were cleaned, a tile drain laid and the hedges trimmed.

A total of 11,980 persons signed the museum register during the year.

Port Royal National Historic Park is situated at Lower Granville, Nova Scotia. A replica of the group of buildings, which sheltered the first European settlers in Canada, has been erected on the exact site where the Port Royal Habitation stood nearly three and a half centuries ago. The original Habitation was the headquarters for about two years of Samuel de Champlain, famous explorer and chief geographer to Henry IV of France, who chose the location and drew up the plan of settlement.

Fresh gravel was spread on the floors of the magazine and wine cellar, ventilators being installed in the latter to offset the trouble from dampness; new steps were constructed in the stockade, cannon were mounted and painted, and the parchment windows were replaced; additional furnishings were obtained, the flagstone walks were repaired and the lawns fertilized and trimmed.

Visitors registered at the park during the year numbered 8,017.

Fortress of Louisbourg National Historic Park is situated about three miles from the town of Louisburg, Cape Breton Island, Nova Scotia. Here were enacted the early stages of the long struggle which culminated in the possession of Canada for the British Crown.

Erected more than two centuries ago by the French, who had named the settlement in honour of Louis XIV, King of France, Louisbourg was captured by the British forces in 1745, but was subsequently handed back to the French. The fortress was again besieged by the English and finally captured by them in 1758. It is interesting to recall that one of the brigades of infantry engaged in the recapture of Louisbourg was commanded by General Wolfe, who was later to die heroically at Quebec.

Arrangements were made with the Nova Scotia Light, Heat and Power Company for their power line to be extended to the Park; a memorial was built over the grave of the Duc d'Anville, whose remains were found some years ago when excavation work was being carried out; four old fire places in the ruins of the hospital were rebuilt and a section of the wall was re-pointed; the bridge over the moat leading to the burying-ground, the casemates at the Citadel, and the archways near the bake-ovens were repaired and new stone walls constructed on each side of the doorway. All exterior trim on the museum and custodian's residence was painted, cement bases and carriages were made for some of the cannon, a garage was built for the new truck, and the entrance road and fences repaired.

A total of 4,858 persons signed the visitors' register.

Fort Beausejour National Historic Park is situated near Sackville, New Brunswick. Built by the French, the fort was intended to be an Acadian stronghold against the undefined claims of the English to Acadia. Around the fort the Acadians had their homes and farms. It was captured by the British, under Monckton, in 1755, when the fort was strengthened and its defences extended by a system of entrenchments, traces of which still remain.

A concrete base was constructed at the north end of the museum building to receive the large millstones which have been obtained; new gun carriages were made and the cannon mounted; the pavilion was painted and broken window panes replaced; the walls, ceiling, and woodwork of the library were painted; the tile floor of the museum was repaired, the interior of the custodian's residence was redecorated, a sump pump installed, and the grounds maintained in good condition.

Visitors registered during the year numbered 16,397.

Fort Chambly National Historic Park is situated about twenty miles southeast of Montreal, on a conspicuous headland on the Richelieu River. The first fort, built by the French in 1665 as a protection against the Iroquois, was of wooden construction. After many vicissitudes, it was rebuilt of stone, this work being completed in 1711. In 1760 the fort was surrendered to the British, who, with a small armed force, held it until 1775.

In that year the Americans captured the fort; they evacuated it the following year, but burned everything that was combustible, leaving only the four walls standing. The fort was later repaired and garrisoned by Sir Guy Carleton and played an important part in the War of 1812.

Repairs were made to the retaining wall where it had been undermined by high water and additional fill placed at the points affected; the interior walls of the museum, the main entrance doors, all picnic benches, tables and signs were painted, and the grounds maintained in good condition.

During the year 26,703 persons signed the museum register.

Fort Lennox National Historic Park is located on Ile-aux Noix in the Richelieu River, about thirteen miles south of St. Johns, Quebec. The present fort, which stands on the site of one previously erected by the French, was built by the imperial authorities in the period from 1812 to 1827. The island, comprising an area of 150 acres, was acquired by the National Parks Service in 1921, and extensive works have since been carried out on the buildings and grounds.

Permission was granted to the Jeunesse Etudiante Catholique Organization to use a portion of the park property during the summer months as a youth training centre; the inner walls, roof, and fireplace of the Officers' Quarters were repaired and the windows painted; the masonry in the archway and along the stairs leading to the second floor of the Guard House was pointed; the Parade Ground was levelled and the drains cleaned; a new roof was placed on the Commissariat Building; the entrance bridge was repaired and the railings painted; the windows in the Men's Barracks and Canteen were repaired, a new boat-house was constructed, dead trees and branches were removed from the moat and ramparts, the picnic tables were painted, and the grounds kept in good condition. Arrangements were made to have the road from the highway, to the wharf repaired.

Visitors registered in the park during the year numbered 1,303.

Fort Wellington National Historic Park is situated at the east end of the town of Prescott, Ontario, and adjacent to Highway No. 2. The fort, named after the Duke of Wellington, was erected when the British authorities decided to fortify Prescott as one of the most vulnerable points of attack in the War of 1812, and as the main base for the defence of communications between Kingston and Montreal. It remains as it was when finally completed in 1838, an impressive landmark.

A new Macadam surface was placed on the entrance road and parking area; repairs were made to the earthworks and a number of new benches made and placed at different points for the convenience of visitors; the bronze tablet outlining the historical events connected with the fort was removed from the entrance gate and attached to the outer wall of the block-house; the buildings were painted, the caponniere was drained, and the grounds levelled. Road signs were erected by the Provincial Department of Highways to direct tourists to the fort and permission was granted to the town of Prescott to plant a number of trees along the east side of the park property in memory of the local men who lost their lives in World War II.

A total of 5,800 persons signed the museum register during the year.

Fort Malden National Historic Park is situated in Amherstburg, Ontario. The fort was built in 1797-9 by the second Battalion Royal Canadian

Volunteers. It was strengthened in 1812 as the principal military station on the western frontier and dismantled and abandoned in September, 1813. Only slight evidences of the original fortifications remain.

Arrangements were made with the Department of Public Works to have repairs made to the retaining wall and for additional fill to be placed at the back of the wall; repairs were made to the roof of the Old Mess Hall which was slightly damaged by fire and a spark guard placed on top of the chimney to prevent a recurrence; the museum exhibits have been rearranged, some of which have been moved to the "Old Fort" building, and many additional accessions received. The material for a proposed leaflet relating to the park was forwarded to Professor Fred Landon, the Ontario representative on the Historic Sites and Monuments Board of Canada to be checked.

During the year 14,065 persons signed the museum register.

Fort Prince of Wales National Historic Park is situated at the mouth of Churchill River, Churchill, Manitoba, and comprises an area of approximately fifty acres. The fort was built from plans drawn by English military engineers, to secure control of Hudson Bay for the Hudson's Bay Company and England. Construction was commenced in 1733 and completed in 1771. It was surrendered to, and partially destroyed by, a French naval force under La Perouse in 1782. Its ruins, which are among the most interesting military remains on this continent, have been partly restored and over forty cannon have been unearthed. Those suitable have been mounted on the walls of the fort.

The bronze tablets attached to the outer wall of the fort together with the tablet attached to the cairn at the Open Battery were cleaned; the enamelled signs, that had become damaged, were removed and general supervision carried out.

NATIONAL HISTORIC SITES

The First Responsible Government in the British Empire Overseas, Halifax, N.S. The first Executive Council, chosen exclusively from the party having a majority in the representative branch of a colonial legislature, was formed in Nova Scotia on February 2, 1848, following a vote of want of confidence by the House of Assembly in the preceding Council. This event has been commemorated by the erection of a bronze tablet in the Assembly Chamber of the Parliament Buildings. The tablet was unveiled on March 11, 1948, at the opening of the Nova Scotia Legislature, by His Honour Lieutenant-Governor J. A. D. McCurdy, in the presence of a distinguished gathering.

The Lumber Industry, Saint John, N.B. A cut-stone monument with tablet was erected in Riverview Park to commemorate the events connected with the Lumber Industry. Beginning with the export of masts to France, timber and wooden ships to Great Britain, staves and boards to the West Indies, this industry flourished until the end of the nineteenth century. In the present century the forests have become the basic resource of the pulp and paper industry, and are also of vital importance to the entire commercial, agricultural, and industrial economy of Eastern Canada.

Bliss Carman, Sir Charles G. D. Roberts, and Francis Joseph Sherman, Fredericton, New Brunswick. A cut-stone monument with tablet was erected on the campus of the University of New Brunswick to these out-

standing Canadian poets, all of whom were born in or near Fredericton, educated in the University where the monument stands, and buried in the cemetery of Forest Hill. Their gifts of verse enriched Canadian literature and gained for their common birthplace the designation "The Poets' Corner of Canada." The monument was unveiled on May 15, 1947, by the Honourable D. L. MacLaren, lieutenant-governor of New Brunswick, in the presence of a distinguished gathering, including the Right Honourable Vincent Massey who delivered the main address.

Louis Jolliet, Quebec, P.Q. A cut-stone monument with tablet was erected on Champlain Street to Louis Jolliet, 1645-1700, a native of Quebec, who, with Father Jacques Marquette, discovered and explored the Mississippi River in 1673. The monument was unveiled on October 12, 1947, under the auspices of the Quebec Historical Society.

Survey of the Great Lakes, Owen Sound, Ont. A cut-stone monument with tablet was erected on the grounds of the Public Library to commemorate the Survey of the Great Lakes. In 1814-16 the first Admiralty Survey of Lake Ontario and Georgian Bay was undertaken by Admiral William Fitzwilliam Owen, after whom Owen Sound is named. His successor, Admiral Henry Wolsey Bayfield, completed the first survey of Lakes Erie, Huron, and Superior in 1817-25. The work of these officers rendered great service to Canada by increasing the safety of navigation.

Brigadier-General E. A. Cruikshank, Welland, Ont. A bronze tablet was affixed to the County Court House to Brigadier-General E. A. Cruikshank, historian, soldier, and magistrate. He was Warden of Welland County, 1886, and first chairman of the Historic Sites and Monuments Board of Canada. Born in Bertie Township, Welland County, June 29, 1853 and died in Ottawa, June 23, 1939. The tablet was unveiled under the auspices of the Council of the County of Welland on October 17, 1947.

Archibald Byron Macallum, London, Ontario. A bronze tablet was placed in the County Court House to Archibald Byron Macallum, biologist, chemist, and teacher. He was the first chairman of the National Research Council, 1916-20. Born near Belmont, Ontario, April 7, 1858, and died in London, April 5, 1934.

The Honourable John Norquay, Winnipeg, Man. A bronze tablet was placed in the Legislative Buildings to the Honourable John Norquay, Premier of Manitoba, 1878-87. Of Scottish and Indian blood he symbolizes the contribution of the Métis to civilization. Born at Red River Colony, May 8, 1841, and died in Winnipeg, July 5, 1889.

Louise Crummy McKinney, Claresholm, Alberta. A bronze tablet was placed on the Post Office to Louise Crummy McKinney, the first woman to become a member of a legislature in the British Empire. She was elected by the constituency of Claresholm to the Legislative Assembly of Alberta, June 7, 1917. Born at Frankville, Ontario, September 22, 1868, and died at Claresholm, July 10, 1931. The tablet was unveiled on June 13, 1947.

The Oregon Treaty of 1846, Douglas, B.C. A bronze tablet was attached to the monument erected the previous year on the international boundary in co-operation with the Washington State Historical Society and the British Columbia Historical Association to commemorate the signing of the Oregon Treaty of 1846. Prior to the establishment of the Dominion of

Canada in 1867, Great Britain and the United States, by providing a peaceful settlement to a difficult boundary problem, strengthened the ties existing between the two peoples. Canada has been proud to do her part in perpetuating this relationship and in forging new links of friendship with her neighbour to the south. This tablet and the one erected on the United States side of the monument by the Washington State Historical Society were unveiled in a joint ceremony on November 8, 1947.

Amor de Cosmos, Victoria, B.C. A bronze tablet was placed in the Parliament Buildings to Amor de Cosmos, a leader in the struggle for Confederation and Responsible Government. Premier of British Columbia, 1872-4, he was born in Windsor, N.S. August 20, 1825, and died in Victoria, B.C., July 4, 1897. The tablet was unveiled on January 16, 1948.

REPORT OF THE SECRETARY

CANADIAN HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION ANNUAL MEETING

THE annual meeting of the Canadian Historical Association was held at the Provincial Archives, Victoria, British Columbia, and the University of British Columbia at Vancouver, from June 16 to June 19, 1948. In spite of transportation difficulties caused by the floods in British Columbia in late May, a large number of members of the Association made the journey to the Pacific coast, and the 1948 annual meeting, the first to be held west of the Rockies in the Association's history, was well attended and a marked success.

The general session at Victoria was centred about three papers dealing with the history of British Columbia in the colonial period and as a province of Canada. Dr. Margaret A. Ormsby read a paper on "Canada and the New British Columbia," Mr. Willard E. Ireland presented a paper on "British Columbia's American Heritage," and W. Kaye Lamb's essay entitled "A Bent Twig in British Columbia," was read in his absence by Professor A. C. Cooke.

A conference on local history was held at the Provincial Archives in Victoria on June 17, under the chairmanship of Dr. George W. Spragge, Supervisor of Local History, Department of Education, Ontario. The group considered the state of the writing of local history in Canada today and discussed methods by which the members of the Association might be kept informed of the progress being made in local history in other provinces and the means by which the material bearing on local history might be preserved. It was decided to continue the Local History Committee of the Canadian Historical Association for another year as previously constituted.*

On June 18 the Association reconvened in Vancouver for a general session at the University of British Columbia. Papers were presented which related to the events of 1848 in Canada, Nova Scotia, and the Red River area. These papers included: "Events of 1848 in Canada and Nova Scotia: Comparison and Contrasts," by Dr. R. S. Longley; "Cent Ans de Gouvernement à la Rivière Rouge," by the Rev. Antoine d'Eschambault (read in his absence by l'abbé A. Maheux), and "LaFontaine and 1848 in Canada," by the Rev. V. J. Jensen, S.J. That afternoon a joint session with the Canadian Political Science Association was held at which W. T. Easterbrook presented a paper on "Security, Enterprise and History," and H. N. Fieldhouse read an essay on "The Autonomy and Limitations of Historical Thought." In the evening session the presidential addresses of the two Associations were given, the President of the Canadian Historical Association, F. H. Soward, reading a paper on "1848 and 1948." The final general session held on the morning of June 19, was given up to papers dealing with Canadian cultural history: one by Gérard Morisset on "Les Arts en Nouvelle-France sous le Régime français," and one by Lawren Harris on "The Group of Seven in Canadian History."

The following officers were elected by the Association for the year 1948-9: President, l'Abbé Arthur Maheux, Laval University; vice-pre-

*A full account of the conference on local history in Victoria on June 17, will be found in the *Canadian Historical Review* for June, 1948, pp. 222-3.

sident, A. L. Burt, University of Minnesota; English secretary and treasurer, David M. L. Farr, Carleton College; French secretary, Séraphin Marion, Public Archives of Canada; members of Council to replace those retiring, Norman Fee, Public Archives of Canada; G. P. de T. Glazebrook, University of Toronto; G. O. Rothney, Sir George Williams College; and C. P. Stacey, Historical Section, Department of National Defence.

The 1948 meeting of the Association was the first one to be held in British Columbia in the Association's life and the appreciation of all members was extended to the individuals and institutions which made the gathering possible. Votes of thanks were extended to President N. A. M. MacKenzie and the staff of the University of British Columbia for the provision of excellent facilities for the meeting; to Willard Ireland, provincial archivist, for accommodation for the meetings in Victoria; to Dr. W. N. Sage and the local committee on arrangements, for their effective co-operation; and to the city of Victoria, for a complementary dinner on June 17, 1948.

The Council gave much attention to the question of the financial position of the Association, which had been made difficult by the rising cost of publication of the *Annual Report*. Dr. J. A. Gibson was appointed to head a sub-committee to make recommendations for changes in subscription rates and fees and this committee suggested a general increase in the schedule of fees. The new rates, which were approved by the general meeting of the Association, are as follows: Membership, \$3.00 a year; membership and including subscription to the *Canadian Historical Review* or to the *Bulletin des Recherches Historiques*, \$5.00 a year; membership and including both of the above noted publications, \$6.00 a year. The student membership rate was abolished but a special rate of \$3.00 per year was set up for history clubs in the universities desiring to take the *Canadian Historical Review* or the *Bulletin des Recherches Historiques*. The rate for a combined membership in the Canadian Historical Association and the Canadian Political Science Association was set at \$6.00 a year, following consultation with the executive of the Canadian Political Science Association. The new scale of rates was made retroactive to May 1, 1948.

A special resolution of appreciation on behalf of the Association was tendered to Mr. Norman Fee, who retired from the post of English Secretary and treasurer after twenty-one years of service. This resolution, which was read by Professor D. G. Creighton, was heartily endorsed by the members of the Association. It said:

Mr. Norman Fee, English Secretary and Treasurer of the Canadian Historical Association, is retiring this year, after twenty-one years of service. It has seemed appropriate and desirable that this association should formally record its appreciation of Mr. Fee's long and continued devotion to its interests and welfare.

In 1927, when Mr. Fee first assumed these duties, our association was five years old. In some sense an outgrowth of the old Historic Landmarks Association, it had been formally organized in 1922. These early and formative years were difficult ones; and the association will always be grateful for the work of its founders; but it is no depreciation of their labour to say, that in 1927, the year in which Mr. Fee

was appointed to the office he has since held, the association began a new career of greater usefulness. It was, for example, in this year, the Diamond Jubilee of Confederation, that Professor Wrong, then president, organized what is believed to have been the first of the integrated programmes, centred about some general theme or themes, which have been a feature of our annual meetings for many years now. It was in this year also, under the Mr. Fee's direction, that the minutes and other permanent records of our association were started. The Canadian Historical Association's written history begins with Mr. Fee's appointment. He is our first historian. For twenty-one years he has given his thought and care and effort to the association's growth.

Therefore, be it hereby resolved that the Canadian Historical Association formally records its high appreciation of the value of Mr. Fee's long services and its gratitude for the faithful and effective part which he has played in the organization.

The 1948 meeting of the Association revealed some very encouraging features which seem indicative of future growth. The sound scholarship and industry which produced the papers read before the Association in the most prominent mark of healthy historical writing in Canada; the great interest displayed in the meetings shows a quality of vigour in the Association's membership and a feeling of awareness of historical studies in Canada among many people outside the society. The membership of the Association stands at 420, the highest figure in its history, and in the presence of a favourable public attitude regarding the aims and functions of the Association, it can be expected to grow to an even greater number. The viable state of the Association at this moment can give one every confidence that its contribution to Canadian national life in the years to come will be of measurable significance.

DAVID M. L. FARR

MARCH OF BOOKS

The Canadian Library Association and the Canadian Council for Reconstruction through Unesco have embarked on March of Books, a nation-wide campaign to collect from Canadians books and periodicals of a scholarly nature for distribution to needy libraries in war-devastated countries.

Reconstruction of the educational, scientific and cultural life in war-devastated areas will contribute substantially to peace and progress in the world. All human development depends on the free exchange of ideas and information, and books are the chief instrument of this vital communication. Many overseas libraries were destroyed or damaged during World War II, and almost all were cut off from the tremendous knowledge accumulated in many fields since 1939. Letters from libraries reflect the urgent need for publications in every subject and emphasize particularly the lack of scientific and technical material.

Enquiries about March of Books are welcomed by Mr. W. A. Magill, Director, March of Books, 139½ Sparks Street, Ottawa.

REPORT OF THE TREASURER

STATEMENT OF RECEIPTS AND DISBURSEMENTS FOR THE FISCAL YEAR ENDED APRIL 30, 1948

RECEIPTS

Bank Interest		3.04
Membership Fees and Sale of <i>Reports</i>		
Less amount collected for joint membership and remitted to Canadian Political Science Association	168.00	1,632.50
Grant for Travelling Expenses for C.H.A. members to Vancouver and Victoria.....	2,000.00	\$3,635.54

DISBURSEMENTS

Laval University, Quebec, Expenses C.H.A. Meeting.....		26.96
Canadian Passenger Association		2.50
Audit Fee, Cunningham & Co.		10.00
Exchange	23.89	
Less amount received	22.93	.96
University of Toronto Press:		
Printing <i>Report</i>	562.01	
<i>Canadian Historical Review</i>	363.75	925.76
<i>Bulletin des Recherches Historiques</i>		74.00
Administration		
Clerical Assistance	80.00	
Leclerc Printers	18.09	
Petty cash, including postage	69.17	167.26
S. Marion, travelling expenses to Annual Meeting, Quebec, 1947		25.00
		1,232.44
Repayment of loan to Reserve Account	378.53	1,610.97
Balance on deposit in the Bank of Montreal.....		2,024.57
		\$3,635.54

Examined and found correct.

CUNNINGHAM & Co.,
Auditors.

NORMAN FEE

Secretary-Treasurer

Ottawa, 12th May, 1948.

RESERVE ACCOUNT

Balance 1st May, 1947:		
In Bank	467.73	
Dominion of Canada Bonds	1,000.00	1,467.73
<i>Receipts—</i>		
Bank interest	8.24	
Bond interest	30.00	38.24
Life Membership Fees		104.50
Transferred from Revenue Account		142.74
in repayment of loan.....	378.53	521.27
		\$1,989.00
Balance		
On deposit in Bank of Montreal	989.00	
Dominion of Canada Bonds		
Due 1963 3%	500.00	
Due 1966 3%	500.00	1,000.00
		1,989.00
		\$1,989.00

Examined and found correct,

CUNNINGHAM & Co.,
Auditors

NORMAN FEE

Secretary-Treasurer

Ottawa, May 12, 1948

MEMBERSHIP OF THE CANADIAN HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION

(A) AFFILIATED SOCIETIES AND ORGANIZATIONS

- Acadia University Library*, Wolfville, N.S. Mrs. Mary K. Ingraham, Librarian.
- American Antiquarian Society*, Clifford K. Shipton, Librarian, Worcester, Mass.
- Antiquarian and Numismatic Society of Montreal*, Château de Ramezay, 290 Notre-Dame St. E., Montreal. Victor Morin, LL.D., President, 57 rue Sainte-Jacques ouest, Montréal; Pemberton Smith, Treasurer, 414 St. James St. W., Montreal.
- British Columbia Historical Association*, Rev. J. C. Goodfellow, President, Victoria, B.C.; W. E. Ireland, Hon. Treasurer, Victoria, B.C.; Miss H. R. Boutilier, Hon. Secretary, Vancouver, B.C.
- British Museum*, Dept. of Printed Books, London, W.C. 1, England.
- Canadian Military Institute*, 426 University Ave., Toronto, Ont. Col. F. S. McPherson, President; T. J. Jackson, Secretary-Treasurer.
- Carleton College Library*, 268 First Avenue, Ottawa.
- Chicoutimi, Séminaire de*, Chicoutimi, P.Q.
- Clark University Library*, Worcester, Mass., U.S.A. Louis N. Wilson, Librarian.
- Cleveland Public Library*, 325 Superior Ave., N.E., Cleveland, Ohio, U.S.A. Miss Leta E. Adams, Order Librarian.
- Columbia University Library*, New York, N.Y., U.S.A. D. B. Hepburn, Supervisor, Acquisition Department.
- La Société Historique de la Côte Nord*, Président, Mgr. René Bélanger, Baie-Comeau, Saguenay, P.Q.
- Dalhousie University Library*, Miss Ivy, M. Prikler, Assistant Librarian, Halifax, N.S.
- Dartmouth College Library*, Hanover, New Hampshire, U.S.A.
- Geology and Topography Library*, Dept. of Mines and Resources, Ottawa.
- Hamilton Public Library*, Miss Freda F. Waldon, Librarian, Hamilton, Ont.
- Henry E. Huntington Library and Art Gallery*, San Marino, Calif. Leslie E. Bliss, Librarian; Max Farrand, Director of Research.
- Historical Society of Alberta*, W. Everard Edmonds, Secretary, 11146-91st Ave., Edmonton, Alta.; M. H. Long, Treasurer.
- Hudson's Bay Company*, Canadian Committee Office, Winnipeg.
- Indiana State Library*, 140 N. Senate Ave., Indianapolis, Indiana. Kenneth R. Shaffer, Order Librarian.
- Institute of Historical Research*, University of London, London, England.
- Kingston Historical Society*, R. G. Trotter, President; Ronald L. Way, Secretary-Treasurer, Kingston.
- Kitchener Public Library*, Elizabeth Moore, Librarian, Kitchener.
- Legislative Library of Ontario*, Toronto, Ont. Legislative Librarian (Miss Edith King.)
- Library of Congress*, Washington, D.C.
- Library of Parliament*, Ottawa, Ont. F. A. Hardy, Librarian; Félix Desrochers, General Librarian, Ottawa.
- Literary and Historical Society of Quebec*, Col. Wm. Wood, President; D. S. Scott, Recording Secretary; Baron d'Avray, Corresponding Secretary; G. Henshaw, Treasurer.
- London and Middlesex Historical Society*, Hubert J. Trumper, President; Fred Landon, Treasurer, University of Western Ontario, London; H. Orlo Miller, Secretary, Box 571, London, Ont.
- London Public Library*, Richard E. Crouch, Librarian, London, Ont.; James S. Bell, Treasurer.
- McGill University Library*, Gerhard H. Lomer, M.A., Ph.D., F.L.A., Librarian, Montreal, P.Q.
- McMaster University Library*, Hamilton, Ont.
- MacNab Historical Association*, Wm. MacNab Box, President, P.O. Box 155, Foleyet, Ont.
- Manitoba, Historical and Scientific Society of*, J. E. Ridd, Secretary, 1445 Wellington Crescent, Winnipeg, Man.
- Montréal, Collège de*, 1931 rue Sherbrooke ouest, Montréal, P.Q.
- Mount Royal High School*, Town of Mount Royal, P.Q.
- National Liberal Federation of Canada*, c/o Clive S. Thomas, 172 Wellington Street, Ottawa.
- National Parks Bureau*, Dept. of Mines and Resources, Ottawa, Ont.
- Norwich Pioneers' Society*, T. H. Pobdon, President; A. L. Bushell, Secretary, Norwich, Ont.

- Nouvel-Ontario*, La Société Historique du, Collège du Sacré-Cœur, Sudbury, Ont.,
Rév. F. Lorenzo Cadieux, S. J., Director.
- Nova Scotia Historical Society*. B. E. Paterson, President, c/o Halifax Club, Halifax,
N.S.; F. A. Lane, Box 38, Secretary.
- Ohio State University, University Library*, Columbus, 10, Ohio, U.S.A.
- Ontario Historical Society*, Dr. J. J. Talman, President; Geo. W. Spragge, Treasurer,
84 Gormley Avenue, Toronto 12, Ont.
- Peterborough Public Library*, Peterborough, Ont. (Wm. L. Graff, Librarian.)
- Princeton University Library*, Princeton, N.J., U.S.A. Lawrence Heyl, Acting Librarian.
- Provincial Library of Alberta*. Mrs. Frank Gostick, Librarian, Edmonton, Alta.
- Provincial Library of British Columbia*. Dr. Willard E. Ireland, Provincial Librarian and
Archivist, Parliament Buildings, Victoria, B.C.
- Provincial Library of Manitoba*. J. L. Johnston, Provincial Librarian, Winnipeg, Man.
- Provincial Library of Saskatchewan*. Mrs. Austin Bothwell, Librarian, Regina, Sask.
- Public Archives of Canada*, Ottawa.
- Québec, Département de l'Instruction Publique*, Québec.
- Québec, Ministère des Terres et Forêts*, Québec.
- Queen's University Library*. E. C. Kyte, Librarian, Kingston, Ont.
- Royal Institute of International Affairs*, St. James's Sq., London, S. W. 1, England.
- Saguenay, La Société Historique du*, Abbé Victor Tremblay, Président; André Lemieux,
Secrétaire, Séminaire de Chicoutimi, Chicoutimi, P.Q.
- St-Alexandre, Collège de*, R 1, Pointe Gatineau, P.Q.
- Ste-Anne de la Pocatière, Collège de*, Ste-Anne de la Pocatière, P.Q.
- Saint-Joseph Université, Le Bibliothécaire*, Saint-Joseph, N.B.
- Ste-Marie, Collège de*, 1180 rue Bleury, Montréal, P.Q.
- Ste-Thérèse, Séminaire de*, Ste-Thérèse, P.Q.
- St-Hyacinthe, Séminaire de*, St-Hyacinthe, P.Q.
- Saskatchewan Historical Society*. J. A. Gregory, President; A. T. Hunter, Secretary,
403 McCallum Hill Bldg., Regina, Sask.
- School of Higher Commercial Studies*, 535 Viger Avenue, Montreal.
- Thunder Bay Historical Society*. J. P. Bertrand, President; D. G. Dewar, Secretary-
Treasurer, The Public Library, Fort William, Ont.
- Toronto Public Library*. Charles R. Sanderson, Chief Librarian, College and St. George
Sts., Toronto, Ont.
- Trois-Rivières, Séminaire des*, Trois-Rivières, P.Q.
- Trois-Rivières, Société d'Histoire Régionale de*, Séminaire des Trois-Rivières, P.Q.
- United College Library*. E. M. Graham, Librarian, Winnipeg, Man.
- University of British Columbia Library*. Vancouver, B.C.
- University of California Library*, Berkeley, Calif., U.S.A. Harold L. Leupp, Librarian.
- University of Cincinnati Library*, Burnet Woods Park, Cincinnati, Ohio, U.S.A. Edward
A. Henry, Director of Libraries.
- University of Manitoba Library*. Miss Elizabeth Dafoe, Librarian, Winnipeg, Man.
- University of Oregon Library*, Eugene, Oregon.
- University of Toronto Library*, W. S. Wallace, Librarian, Toronto 5.
- University of Western Ontario, University Library*, London, Ont.
- Victoria University Library*. Miss Emily Keeley, Library Assistant, Toronto, Ont.
- Webster Canadiana Library*, New Brunswick Museum, Saint John, N.B.
- Wellesley College Library*. Lois E. Engleman, Assistant Librarian, Wellesley 81, Mass.,
U.S.A.
- Windsor Public Library*, Miss Anne Hume, Librarian, Windsor, Ont.
- Wisconsin State Historical Society*. 816 State Street, Madison 6, Wisc., U.S.A.
- Women's Canadian Historical Society of Ottawa*. Mrs. J. R. Dickson, President, 2
Thornton Ave., Ottawa; Mrs. D. Roy Cameron, Recording Secretary, 54 Park Road,
Rockcliffe, Ont.; Mrs. Beath Morden, Recording Secretary, 4 Frank St., Ottawa;
Miss Dorothy Barber, Treasurer, 223 Somerset St. W., Ottawa.
- Women's Canadian Historical Society of Toronto*. Miss C. Roberts, President, 20 Earl
St., Toronto; Miss Kate Symon, Corresponding Secretary, 68 Avenue Rd., Toronto;
Mrs. C. L. Corless, Treasurer.
- Women's Wentworth Historical Society*. Mrs. George Wood Brown, President, 159 Aber-
deen Ave., Hamilton, Ont.; Mrs. Bertie D. Smith, Secretary, 284 Hess St. S.,
Hamilton; Mrs. W. H. Magill, Treasurer.
- Yale University Library*. Donald G. Wing, Accessions Department, New Haven, Conn.,
U.S.A.
- York-Sunbury Historical Society*. Sterling Brannen, Treasurer, P.O. Box 568, Fredericton,
N.B.

(B) LIFE MEMBERS

Bell, Dr. Winthrop, Chester, N.S.
 Brebner, J. Bartlet, Dept. of History, Columbia University, New York, N.Y.
 Brown, Dr. George W., Baldwin House, University of Toronto, Toronto 5
 Burt, A. L., University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minn.
 Eames, Frank, Box 180 Gananoque, Ont.
 Ellis, Ralph, University of Kansas, Lawrence, Kansas, U.S.A.
 Graham, Gerald S., Dept. of History, Birkbeck College, University of London, London
 London, EC 4, Eng.
 Grant-Suttie, Col. G. L. P., 110 St. George St., Toronto
 Hardy, Mrs. A. C., Brockville, Ont.
 Helstrom, C. T. E., Box 27, Gray, Sask.
 Hudson's Bay Company, Hudson's Bay House, Winnipeg
 Hyde, James H., Hotel Savoy-Plaza, 5th Avenue, New York, N.Y., U.S.A.
 Lanctot, Dr. Gustave, Dominion Archives, Ottawa
 Landon, Fred, University of Western Ontario, London, Ont.
 Leonard, Col. Ibbotson, 782 Wellington St., London, Ont.
 Long, Morden H., University of Alberta, Edmonton
 Lower, Dr. A. R. M., Queen's University, Kingston
 Macdonald, Norman, Department of History, McMaster University, Hamilton, Ont.
 Mackenzie, Donald R., 273 Powell Avenue, Ottawa, Ont.
 Morgan, F. Cleveland, 1455 Union Avenue, Montreal, P.Q.
 Morse, Dr. W. Inglis, 17 Fresh Pond Parkway, Cambridge, Mass.
 Musson, Charles J., 480 University Ave., Toronto
 Myers, Leslie P., 89 Durie St., Toronto 3
 Raymond, Hon. D., The Senate, Ottawa, Ont.
 Rimouski, Evêque de, Rimouski, P.Q.
 Riordon, Carl, 374 Cote-des-Neiges Rd., Montreal
 Ross, J. K. L., 270 Cote-des-Neiges Rd., Montreal
 Sage, Dr. Walter N., University of British Columbia, Vancouver
 Saunders, Richard M., Baldwin House, University of Toronto, Toronto, Ont.
 Scott, S. Morley, Dept. of External Affairs, Ottawa, Ont.
 Sifton, Victor, *Winnipeg Free Press*, Winnipeg
 Smith, Pemberton, 414 St. James St. W., Montreal
 Somerville, Mrs. J. M., 355 B. Kenniston Apts., Elgin Street, Ottawa
 Stacey, Col. C. P., Dept. of National Defence, (Army) Ottawa, Ont.
 Tombs, Guy, 1111 Beaver Hall Hill, Montreal
 Tweed, T. W., 9 Burlington Cres., Toronto 10
 Underhill, Frank H., Department of History, University of Toronto, Toronto
 Wilson, Hon. Cairine N., The Senate, Ottawa, Ont.
 Wright, Mrs. E. C., Box 559, Wolfville, N.S.

(C) ANNUAL MEMBERS

Achilles, Miss Frances, 1040 Park Avenue, New York 28, N.Y.	Anderson, Mrs. J. R., 371 Claremont Ave., Westmount, Montreal
Adair, E. R., McGill University, Montreal	Anderson, William, University of Minne- sota, Minneapolis, Minn.
Adams, Eric G., 2100 Clarendon Ave., Apt. 3 Montreal	Armstrong, Dr. Elizabeth, 2500 Q St., N.W., Washington
Addison, Miss Ruth, Economic Research Branch, Dept. of Reconstruction & Sup- ply, Ottawa	Armstrong, P. C., C.P.R. Co., Montreal
Agnew, D. J., 696 Echo Drive, Ottawa	Arrell, Alex H., Cayuga, Ont.
Aitcheson, Major J. H., 1174 St. David's St., Victoria, B.C.	Atherton, Dr. W. H., 1185 St. Matthew St., Montreal
Alberts, Gerald A., 56 Berkeley Ave., Yonkers, N.Y.	Bailey, Alfred, University of New Bruns- wick, Fredericton, N.B.
Allard, M. l'abbé J.-A., c/o Academic Sainte-Famille, Tracadie, N.B.	Barbeau, C.-M., 260 McLaren St., Ottawa
Allard, L'hon. Jules, Palais de Justice, Montréal	Beaugrand-Champagne, Aristide, 1071 Blvd. Mont-Royal, Outremont, P.Q.
Allen, James G., Dept. of History, Univer- sity of Colorado, Boulder, Col., U.S.A.	Bêck, J. M., Lunenburg, N.S.
Allison, G. C., <i>The Winnipeg Tribune</i> , Winnipeg	Beer, Lt. W. A., 188 St. George St., To- ronto
	Berry, W. M., c/o P.F.R.A., 910 McCallum Hill Bldg., Regina

(C) ANNUAL MEMBERS—*Continued*

- Bell, Dr. Winthrop, Chester, N.S.
 Bernier, J.-E., 27, Deuxième Avenue, Iberville, P.Q.
 Berridge, Dr. W. A., Metropolitan Life Insurance Co., 1 Madison Ave., New York, N.Y.
 Berringer, Donald A., 3585 West 41st Ave., Vancouver
 Bird, John, *Winnipeg Tribune*, Winnipeg
 Black, Robert Adair, 1301 Traction Bldg., Cincinnati, Ohio
 Blackwood, T. A., 27 Community Apts., Saskatoon
 Bladen, V. W., 273 Bloor St. W., Toronto
 Bogart, E. C., 4 Wychwood Park, Toronto
 Bois, H. C., Coopérative Fédérée de Québec, 130 est, rue St-Paul, Montréal
 Bonenfant, Jean-Charles, Bibliothèque du Parlement, Québec
 Booth, Mrs. Godfrey, 1044 Collinson St., Victoria
 Boucher, G. P., Economics Division, Dept. of Agriculture, Ottawa
 Boucher, Jean, Faculté des Sciences Sociales, Université Laval, Québec
 Bouffard, Paul-Henri 229 rue St. Joseph, Québec, P.Q.
 Boutilier, Miss Helen R., 976—West 13th Ave., Vancouver
 Brady, Alexander, Economics Building, University of Toronto, Toronto
 Brault, Lucien, Archives nationales, Ottawa
 Brebner, J. Bartlet, Dept. of History, Columbia University, New York, N.Y.
 Brining, N. R., 1035 Jean Talon Avenue West, Apt. 9, Montreal 15
 Britnell, G. E., Dept. of Economics, University of Saskatchewan, Saskatoon
 Bronson, F. E., 725 Acacia Ave., Rockcliffe, Ont.
 Brough, T. A., 4679 West 15th Street, Vancouver, B.C.
 Brouillette, Benoit, 535 avenue Viger, Montréal
 Brown, C., 95 Cremazie Street, Quebec
 Brown, George W., Baldwin House, University of Toronto, Toronto
 Brown, W. J., 1006 Wellington St., London, Ont.
 Browne, Col. Peter L., Old Supreme Court Bldg., Ottawa
 Bruchési, Jean, Sous-Secrétaire de la Province, 273 ave. Laurier, Québec
 Burbey, Louis H., *The Detroit Times*, Detroit 26, Mich.
 Burchill, C. S., Dept. of History, University of Alberta, Edmonton
 Burchell, Waveney, 10735-79th St., Edmonton
 Burford, W. T., Canadian Federation of Labour, 78 Bank St., Ottawa
 Burnett, Miss Jean, 273 Bloor St., West, Toronto
 Burt, A. L., University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minn.
 Burwash, Miss Dorothy, 53 Daly Ave., Ottawa
 Buzek, Mrs. Karel, 29 Madison Avenue, Toronto 5
 Cail, Robert E., R.R. No. 2, Vernon, B.C.
 Calder, J. C., Innisfail, Alta.
 Calder, Mrs. J. C., Innisfail, Alta.
 Cameron, Dr. G. S., 318 Stewart St., Peterborough, Ont.
 Carrière, Joseph M., Box 1786, University Station, Charlottesville, Va.
 Carrothers, W. A., Public Utilities Comm., 510 Central Bldg., Victoria, B.C.
 Carter, Miss Gwendolen M., Smith College, Northampton, Mass., U.S.A.
 Casgrain, Mrs. Pierre, 246 Elm Avenue, Westmount, Montreal
 Caty, J. J., Ross Mines, Holtyre, Ont.
 Chartier, Mgr., 11 rue Gordon, Apt. 3, Sherbrooke
 Choate, Miss Bessie P., Canadian Bank of Commerce, Vancouver
 Church, H. B., Barrister, Orangeville, Ont.
 Clark, S. Delbert, 273 Bloor St. W., Toronto
 Clay, Charles, 142 O'Connor St., Ottawa
 Clay, Miss Margaret J., Apt. 101, 861 Linden Ave., Victoria
 Clerihue, V. R., 789 W. Pender St., Vancouver
 Cleverdon, Miss Catherine L., 33 Deshon Ave., Bronxville, N.Y.
 Coats, Dr. R. H., c/o F.A.O., 1735 de Sales St., N.W., Washington, D.C.
 Colby, C. W., 1240 Pine Ave. W., Montreal
 Cole, Taylor, Dept. of Political Science, Duke University, Durham, N.C.
 Coleman, E. H., Under-Secretary of State, Ottawa
 Collins, Ross W., Dept. of History, University of Alberta, Edmonton
 Conacher, J. B., Baldwin House, University of Toronto, Toronto
 Condon, Miss Catherine A., 70 College Avenue, Ottawa
 Conklin, Mrs. W. D., Kingsville, Ont.
 Cook, Morris, 3 Devonshire Place, Toronto
 Cooke, A. C., University of British Columbia, Vancouver
 Cooper, H. S., Bank of Commerce Bldg., 6 James St. N., Hamilton
 Cooper, John Irwin, McGill University, Montreal
 Corey, Albert B., Sunset Rd., R.D.1, Castleton, N.Y.
 Coutts, G. B., 517 Seventh Ave. W., Calgary
 Coyne, J. M., 220 Yale Avenue, Winnipeg

(C) ANNUAL MEMBERS—*Continued*

- Crean, J. G., 18 Balmuto St., Toronto
 Creighton, Donald G., Baldwin House, University of Toronto, Toronto
 Crouse, Nellis M., 414 Cayuga Heights Road, Ithaca, N.Y.
 Cunningham & Co., 165 Sparks St., Ottawa
 Currie, A. W., 273 Bloor St. W., Toronto
 Currie, N. E., United College, Winnipeg
- Dadson, Thomas, Wolfville, N.S.
 Davies, Geoffrey O. B., University of British Columbia, Vancouver
 Davis, R. E. G., Canadian Welfare Council, 245 Cooper Street, Ottawa
 Dawson, R. MacG., 273 Bloor St. W., Toronto
 Demers, M. le juge Philippe, Palais de Justice, Montréal
 Dent, C. R., 24 Rowanwood Ave., Toronto
 Derome, Gaston, 8263 rue Drolet, Montréal 10
 D'Eschambault, M. l'abbé Antoine, Presbytère St. Emile, St. Emile's Rectory, B. P. Genthon, Man.
 Desranleau, S. Exc. Mgr. P., Sherbrooke, P.Q.
 Desrosiers, M. l'abbé Adélar, Principal de l'École Normale, Montréal
 Deutsch, John J., Dept. of Finance, Ottawa
 Dewey, A. Gordon, Brooklyn College, Brooklyn, N.Y.
 Dexter, Grant, 244 Kingsway Avenue, Winnipeg
 Dickson, Mrs. J. R., "Rideaufields", P.O. Box 743, Ottawa
 Dobbin, R. L., Reid St., Peterborough, Ont.
 Donnelly, R. P. Joseph P., Saint Louis University, Saint-Louis 3, Miss.
 Dorland, Arthur Garratt, University of Western Ontario, London, Ont.
 Duff, Louis Blake, Niagara Finance Company Limited, Welland, Ont.
 Duguid, Col. Fortescue, D.S.O., Historical Section, Dept. of National Defence, 175 Nepean St., Ottawa
- Eames, Frank, Box 180, Gananoque, Ont.
 Easterbrook, W. T., University of Manitoba, Winnipeg
 Eastman, S. Mack, University of Saskatchewan, Saskatoon
 Eastwood, Austin, West Bank, Baghdad, Iraq
 Edwards, W. A., 4384 Sherbrooke St. W., Westmount, Montreal
 Egan, Rev. D'Arcy L., St. Alphonsus Seminary, Woodstock, Ont.
 Eisenberg, Benzion, 308 Berriman Street, Brooklyn 8, N.Y.
 Eleanora, Sister Mary, St. Mary's Academy, Crescentwood, Winnipeg
- Ellis, Ralph, University of Kansas, Lawrence, Kansas, U.S.A.
 Ells, Miss Margaret, Public Archives of Nova Scotia, Halifax
 England, Robert, Patricia Bay, R.R.1, Sydney, V.I., B.C.
 Ewart, T. S., 6 Lakeview Terrace, Ottawa
- Fabre-Surveyer, L'hon. juge E., 128, avenue Maplewood, Outremont, P.Q.
 Falardeau, J. C., 12 Haldimand St., Quebec
 Farr, David M. L., Carleton College, Ottawa
 Faucher, Albert, Faculté des Sciences Sociales, Université Laval, Québec
 Fee, Norman, Public Archives of Canada, Ottawa
 Ferguson, R. D., 14 Cavendish Avenue, Toronto
 Ferland-Angers, Mme A., 251 Milton St., Apt. 33, Montreal
 Ferns, H. S., United College, Winnipeg
 Field, H. H., 49 Chrysler Ave., Ottawa
 Fieldhouse, H. N., Dept. of History, McGill University, Montreal
 Firestone, O. J., Dept. of Reconstruction and Supply, No. 2 Bldg., Ottawa
 Flemington, Frank, The Ryerson Press, 299 Queen Street W., Toronto
 Flenley, R., Baldwin House, University of Toronto, Toronto
 Flynn, Jr., Oscar Rogers, 630 Fifth Avenue, New York
 Fodchuk, Miss Mary J., Wadena, Sask.
 Foran, Mrs. T. P., 147 Wilbrod St., Ottawa
 Forsey, A. E., 3 Lakeview Terrace, Ottawa
 Forsyth, Charles H., 999 Jessie Avenue, Winnipeg
 Forsyth, Mrs. George, c/o Brown Corp., Sanmaur, P.Q.
 Foster, Miss Joan, Trafalgar School for Girls, Montreal
 Fraser, Clarence, Peel Gardens, Port Credit, Ont.
 Freedman, Max, *Winnipeg Free Press*, Winnipeg
 Frégault, Guy, 3275 Lacombe Ave., Apt. 3, Montréal 26
- Gamble, C. L., 212 Park Ave., Brantford, Ont.
 Garland, Rev. M. A., University of Western Ontario, London, Ont.
 Garner, John, 273 Bloor St. West, Toronto
 Garton, P. Douglas, 414 St. James St., Montreal
 Gartz, Victor E., 1321 Sherbrooke St. W., Montreal 25
 Gates, Mrs. Lillian F., Cornell University, Ithaca, N.Y.

(C) ANNUAL MEMBERS—*Continued*

- Gelley, T. F., Royal Military College, Kingston
- Gibb, Harley L., 2380 Cortland Ave., Detroit, Mich.
- Gibson, Frederick W., 151 Union St. W., Kingston, Ont.
- Gibson, James A., Carleton College, Ottawa
- Gibson, John Aubrey, 912 Federal Bldg., 85 Richmond St. W., Toronto 1
- Gibson, J. D., 406 Glenayr Rd., Toronto
- Glazebrook, G. deT., Baldwin House, University of Toronto, Toronto
- Glover, Richard G., University of Manitoba, Winnipeg
- Goldberg, Simon, 3 Percy Street, Apt. 6, Ottawa
- Graham, Gerald S., Department of History, Birkbeck College, University of London, London EC 4, England
- Graham, William Roger, Regina College, University of Saskatchewan, Regina
- Grant, L. S., 4064 West 15th Avenue, Vancouver
- Grantham, Ronald, Editorial Dept., Ottawa Citizen, Ottawa
- Grant-Suttie, Lt.-Col. G. L. P., 110 St. George St., Toronto
- Gravel, C.-E., 3570, rue McTavish, Montréal
- Gray, G. L., Dept. of Education, Toronto
- Greenaway, Miss Ellen M., 1037 Craigdarroch Rd., Victoria
- Gregory, Herbert W., Public Archives, Ottawa
- Griffin, John William, 226 Bay St., Toronto 1
- Groulx, M. l'abbé Lionel, 261, avenue Bloomfield, Outremont, P.Q.
- Guilday, Rev. Peter, 305 Mullen Memorial Library, Catholic University of America, Washington, D.C.
- Hahn, Paul, 22 Bloor St. East, Toronto
- Hahn, Mrs. Paul, 7 Lynwood Avenue, Toronto
- Halliwell, H. M., 1213 Aird Street, Saskatoon
- Hamilton, Louis, 77 Ladbrooke Grove House, London, W. 11, England
- Harris & Co., Ltd., W. C., 255 Bay Street, Toronto 1
- Harriss, C. Lowell, 55 Hadley Ave., Dayton 9, Ohio
- Harvey, Daniel C., Public Archives of Nova Scotia, Halifax
- Harwood, C. A., K.C., "Alaincour" Vaudreuil, P.Q.
- Havens, Edmund G., R.F.D. No. 1, Box 210, Handerson, Colo.
- Heaton, Herbert, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minn.
- Helleiner, K. F., 273 Bloor St. W., Toronto
- Helstrom, Theodore, Box 27, Gray, Sask.
- Heron, John R., Head Office, Royal Bank of Canada, Montreal
- Hershaw, Ogden, 149 South Drive, Toronto
- Hewson, C. G., West Hill High School, N.D.G., Montreal
- Hitchins, Fred H., 140 Kenilworth Street, Ottawa
- Holmes, Charles, 294 St. Catherine Street West, Montreal
- Holmes, Henry Cuthbert, c/o Pemberton Holmes Ltd., Victoria.
- Hubbard, Dr. Robert H., National Gallery, Ottawa
- Hudon, R. P. Léo, 14 rue Dauphine, Québec
- Humphrey, John P., McGill University, Montreal
- Hyde, James H., Hotel Savoy-Plaza, New York 22, N.Y., U.S.A.
- Innis, Harold A., Economics Bldg., University of Toronto, Toronto
- Ireland, Willard E., Provincial Library and Archives, Victoria, B.C.
- Irwin, Miss Winnifred, 1298 West 10th Avenue, Vancouver
- Jack, A. B., 273 Bloor St. West, Toronto
- Jefferys, Charles W., York Mills, Ont.
- Jennings, F. C., Librarian, Carnegie Library, Ottawa
- Johnston, J. G., Northern Ontario Bldg., Toronto 2, Ont.
- Johnston, Robert A. A., 112 Old Forest Hill Rd., Toronto
- Jones, Robert L., Ph.D., Marietta College, Marietta, Ohio
- Josie, Capt. G. H., 261 Laurier Ave., East, Ottawa, Ont.
- Kayes, Samuel B., 211 Collingwood Street, Kingston, Ont.
- Keep, George R. C., c/o Mrs. Ferris, The Old Hall, East Bridgford, Notts., England
- Kerr, D. G. G., Mount Allison University, Sackville, N.B.
- Ketcheson, Fred G., 123 Glendale Ave., Toronto
- Kinchen, Oscar A., Texas Technological College, Lubbock, Texas
- King, G. B., United College, Winnipeg
- King, Right Hon. W. L. Mackenzie, Ottawa
- Kirkconnell, Watson, Acadia University, Wolfville, N.S.
- Krever, H., 279 Belsize Drive, Toronto
- Lafamme, M. l'abbé Eug.-C., 16 rue Buade, Québec
- Laing, Dr. I. H., University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Mich.
- Laird, David H., K.C., 400 Victory Bldg., Winnipeg

(C) ANNUAL MEMBERS—*Continued*

- Laliberte, Edouard, Edifice Credit Foncier,
72 Cote de la Montagne, Québec
 Lamb, W. Kaye, Public Archives, Ottawa
 Lambert, Hon. Norman P., The Senate,
Ottawa
 Lanctot, Gustave, Archives publiques du
Canada, Ottawa
 Lanctot, J. B., 631 Logan Street, St. Lam-
bert, P.Q.
 Landon, Fred, 846 Hellmuth Ave., London,
Ont.
 Lane, J. B., Apt. 7, 21 Cooper St., Ottawa
 Langlois, Jean Sandfield Macdonald, H.M.-
C.S., Royal Rds., V.I., B.C.
 LaViolette, F. E., McGill University, Mont-
real
 Lawson, Dr. Murray G., History Depart-
ment, Syracuse University, Syracuse
10, N.Y.
 Laycock, J. E., McGill School of Social
Work, 3600 University Street, Montreal
 Lebel, Paul, 206 Brown Ave., Quebec
 Lefebvre, J. J., 1700 St-Denis, Montréal
 Leonard, Col. Ibbotson, 782 Wellington
St., London, Ont.
 Lermer, Arthur, 1900 Clinton Avenue,
Montreal
 Levick, A. A., 7070 Sherbrooke St., West
Montreal, P.Q.
 Lingard, Cecil C., 14 Old Mill Terrace,
Toronto 9
 Lipset, S. M., Dept. of Sociology, Univer-
sity of California, Berkeley, Calif.
 Little, W. J., Victoria University, Toronto
 Long, Mrs. Ernest E., 663 Dollard Blvd.,
Outremont
 Long, Morden H., University of Alberta,
Edmonton
 Longley, R. S., Dept. of History, Acadia
University, Wolfville, N.S.
 Longstaff, Major Frederick Victor, Sea-
bank, 50 King George Terrace, Victoria
 Lovell, Colin Rhys, University of Southern
California, University Park, Los Angeles
7, Calif.
 Lower, A. R. M., Queen's University,
Kingston, Ont.
 Lunn, Miss Jean, 458 Argyle Ave., West-
mount, P.Q.
 McClung, Miss Helen, Ontario Archives,
Parliament Bldgs., Toronto
 McCulley, Joseph, Deputy Commissioner
of Penitentiaries, Justice Bldg., Ottawa
 MacDermot, T. W. L., Dept. of External
Affairs, Ottawa
 MacDonald, Rev. J. A., St. Francis Xavier
University, Antigonish, N.S.
 Macdonald, Norman, Dept. of History,
McMaster University of Hamilton, Ont.
 MacDonell, Malcom, St. Francis Xavier
University, Antigonish, N.S.
 McEachern, F. F., 109 Glenayr Road,
Toronto
 MacFarlane, R. O., Dept. of Education,
Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg
 MacGibbon, D. A., Board of Grain Com-
missioners, Winnipeg
 McGibbon, D. W., Imperial Oil Ltd., 56
Church St., Toronto
 McHenry, Dean E., University of Cali-
fornia, Los Angeles 24, Calif.
 McIlwraith, T. F., Royal Ontario Muse-
um, Toronto
 MacInnes, C. M., University of Bristol,
Bristol, England
 McInnis, Edgar, University of Toronto,
Toronto 5, Ont.
 McIvor, R. Craig, McMaster University,
Hamilton, Ont.
 MacKay, R. A., Dept. of External Affairs,
Ottawa
 McKelvie, B. A., Lafortune Road, Cobble
Hill, V.I., B.C.
 Mackenzie, Donald R., 339 Island Park
Drive, Ottawa
 Mackenzie, N. A. M., University of British
Columbia, Vancouver
 MacKinnon, Frank, 43 Park Avenue, Ot-
tawa
 MacKinnon, Rev. Hugh, St. Paul's Col-
lege, Winnipeg
 Mackintosh, W. A., Queen's University,
Kingston
 MacKirdy, K. A., 88 Runnymede Rd., To-
ronto 3
 MacLachlan, Robert D., P.O. Box 903,
Victoria, B.C.
 MacLaren, C. H., 14 Metcalfe St., Ottawa
 MacLean, Rt. Rev. Mgr. Donald A., Catho-
lic University of America, Washington,
D.C.
 MacLean, Miss Murena, Morris School,
Box 126, Morris, Man.
 McLennan, F. D., Drawer 908, Cornwall,
Ont.
 Macleod, J. E. A., 323 Fourth Ave. W.,
Calgary
 MacLeod, Mrs. Margaret Arnett, 138
Maryland Street, Winnipeg
 MacLeod, W. A., Can. Co-operative Wheat
Producers, Ltd., Winnipeg
 MacNab, John E., 183 Lawrence Avenue
East, Toronto
 McNaught, K. W., 458 Montague Avenue,
Winnipeg
 MacNutt, W. S., History Dept., Univer-
sity of New Brunswick, Fredericton
 Macpherson, Miss Marion, U.N. Division,
Dept. of External Affairs, Ottawa
 MacQuarrie, Heath N., Alexander College,
University of New Brunswick, Fred-
ericton
 MacVean, Wm. C., 237 Lonsmount Dr.,
Toronto 10

(C) ANNUAL MEMBERS—*Continued*

- Machum, L. A., 13 Enterprise St., Moncton, N.B.
 Magrath, C. A., 841 St. Charles St., Victoria
 Maheux, M. l'abbé Arthur, Archiviste, Université Laval, Québec
 Major, T. G., Box 125, Port of Spain, Trinidad, B.W.I.
 Malchelosse, Gérard, 5759, avenue Durocher, Montréal
 Mallory, J. R., McGill University, Montreal
 Manny, Miss Louise, Newcastle, Miramichi, N.B.
 Marchand, G., 59 St. James St. West, Montreal
 Marin, C. H., 675 Dorchester St. W., Montreal
 Marion, Séraphin, Archives nationales, Ottawa
 Marsh, Donald B., Purvis Hall, McGill University, Montreal
 Martin, Chester, Baldwin House, University of Toronto, Toronto
 Massey, Hon. Vincent, Batterwood House, Port Hope, Ont.
 Masters, D. C., Bishop's University, Lennoxville, P.Q.
 Matthews, Mrs. H. C., Navy St., Oakville, Ont.
 Matthews, W. D., Dept. of External Affairs, Ottawa
 Maurault, Mgr Olivier, 1000 est, boulevard Crémazie, Montréal
 Maxwell, Mrs. E. J., 603 Belleville St., Victoria
 Miller, Harry, 63 Merton Road, Hampstead, P.Q.
 Miller, Roscoe R., 64 Glenlake Avenue, Toronto
 Milligan, Frank A., 1047 Dorchester Ave., Winnipeg
 Mills, G. H. S., 3521 Redpath Street, Montreal
 Mills, L. J., Director of Financial Services, Post Office Dept., Ottawa
 Milne, C. V., 829 Royal Ave., Calgary, Alta.
 Minville, E., Écoles des Hautes Études Commerciales, 535 avenue Viger, Montréal
 Monahan, F., 1844 Allison Road, Vancouver
 Moore, Horace E., *The Whitehorse Star*, Whitehorse, Y.T.
 Morgan, F. Cleveland, 1455 Union Ave., Montreal
 Morin, R. P. Conrad, 3113 avenue Guyard, Montréal 26
 Morin, Victor, 57 ouest, rue Saint-Jacques, Montréal
 Morrison, Miss Ruth M., University of British Columbia, Vancouver
 Morton, W. L., University of Manitoba, Winnipeg
 Mowbray, G. E., Suite 175, Graduate College, Princeton, N.J.
 Mullally, Dr. Emmet J., 2021 Union Ave., Montreal
 Mulock, William J., 172 Wellington St., Ottawa
 Munro, W. B., 268 Bellefontaine St., Pasadena, Cal.
 Munroe, David, Ormstown Academy, Ormstown, P.Q.
 Murphy, Miss Ethel, Box 145, Clarkson, Ont.
 Murray, Miss Jean E., University of Saskatchewan, Saskatoon
 Murray, S. G., 273 Bloor St. W., Toronto
 Murray, W. H., 36 Churchill Ave., Westmount, P.Q.
 Myers, Leslie P., 89 Durie St., Toronto
 Mylrea, A. J., c/o Reed, Shaw & McNaught, Ins., 64 Wellington St., W., Toronto 1
 Nadeau, Dr. Gabriel, Rutland State Sanatorium, Rutland, Mass.
 Neatby, Miss Hilda, University of Saskatchewan, Saskatoon
 New, Chester W., McMaster University, Hamilton, Ont.
 Newfield, I. G., Bethel College, North Newton, Kansas
 Nicholson, Lt.-Col. G. W. L., 39 Somerset Street West, Ottawa
 Norris, W. Glenn, Tompkins County Clerk, Court House, Ithaca, N.Y.
 O'Connell, M. P., Asst. Sec. Treas., C.P.-S.A., 273 Bloor St. W., Toronto
 Oleson, T. J., Dept. of History, United College, Winnipeg
 Ormsby, Miss Margaret A., Dept. of History, University of British Columbia, Vancouver
 Ormsby, William G., Public Archives, Ottawa
 Papineau, Mgr, Evêché de Joliette, Joliette, P.Q.
 Paquin, Peter Paul, 2351 Garneau Park, Ville-Emard, Montréal
 Parizeau, Gérard, 10 Avenue Glencoe, Outremont
 Park, Lt. J. D., 10927 88th Ave., Edmonton
 Peake, Rev. F. A., 11349-130th St., Edmonton
 Peardon, Thos. P., Columbia University, New York, N.Y.
 Penlington, Dr. Norman, 127 Summerhill Ave., Toronto
 Pettit, Sydney, 14242 Pacific Highway S., Seattle, Wash.
 Phillips, A. T., 324 Montrose Avenue, East Kildonan, Manitoba

(C) ANNUAL MEMBERS—*Continued*

- Phillips, Lester H., University of Redlands, Redlands, Calif.
 Pickersgill, J. W., Dept. of External Affairs, Ottawa
 Pierce, Lorne, The Ryerson Press, Toronto
 Pigeon, J. A. R., 139½ rue Cremazie, Quebec
 Podea, Mrs. Iris S., 817 Fifth Avenue, New York 21, N.Y.
 Pope, Macaulay, 52 Crescent Rd., Toronto
 Potvin, M. l'abbé Pascal, Archives, Université Laval, Québec
 Pouliot, R. P. Adrien, 14 rue Dauphine, Québec
 Pouliot, R. P. Léon, 1855 est, rue Rachel, Montréal
 Preston, Anthony W., Bishop's University, Lennoxville, P.Q.
 Preston, R. A., Royal Military College, Kingston
 Preston, Mrs. Marjorie E., Dept. of History, University of Toronto, Toronto 5
 Pritchett, John Perry, Queen's College, College of the City of New York, New York, U.S.A.
 Prodrick, Capt. R. G., 241 Park Road, Rockcliffe, Ottawa

 Radford, Jack, 27 Bedford Road, Toronto
 Ray, Eldon P., 197 Murray Street, Peterborough, Ont.
 Reaman, G. E., Dept. of English, Ontario Agricultural College, Guelph
 Reid, Miss Allana, 152 Hillcrest Ave., Montreal West, P.Q.
 Reid, Escott M., Dept. of External Affairs, Ottawa
 Reid, J. H. Stewart, Dept. of History, United College, Winnipeg
 Remick, III, Jerome H., Box 802, Williams College, Williamstown, Mass.
 Reynolds, C. Murray, Van Houten Block, 16 Commercial St., Nanaimo, B.C.
 Richardson, A. J. H., Public Archives, Ottawa
 Riddell, R. G., Dept. of External Affairs, Ottawa
 Rife, C. W., Hamline University, St. Paul, Minn.
 Rimouski, S. Exc. Mgr l'évêque de, Rimouski, P.Q.
 Robbins, Dr. J. E., 166 Marlborough Ave., Ottawa
 Roberts, Miss D. M., 3220 Westmount Blvd., Westmount, P.Q.
 Robinson, Percy J., Box 102, Aurora, Ont.
 Roe, Frank Gilbert, 2547 Killarney Road, Cadboro Bay, Victoria
 Rolland, Herman J., 4318 Earnscliffe Ave., Montreal
 Rolph, W. K., University of Western Ontario, London, Ont.
 Rosenberg, L., 3430 Park Avenue, Montreal.
 Ross, Miss Aileen D., 1514 MacKay St., Montreal
 Ross, Miss Dorothy, 367 Metcalfe Ave., Westmount
 Ross, Mrs. F. M., 4899 Belmont Avenue, Vancouver
 Rothney, Gordon O., Sir George Williams College, Montreal
 Roy, Ferdinand, Palais de Justice, Québec
 Roy, Pierre-Georges, 44, rue Wolfe, Lévis, P.Q.
 Rutherford, W. D., Brantford Board of Trade, Hotel Kerby, Brantford, Ont.

 Sage, Donald, 4687 W. Fourth Ave., Vancouver
 Sage, W. N., University of British Columbia, Vancouver
 Sametz, Z. W., 435 MacLaren Street, Ottawa
 Samuel, Dr. Sigmund, 104 Forest Hill Rd., Toronto
 Sanderson, Charles R., Chief Librarian, Toronto Public Library, Toronto
 Sandwell, B. K., *Saturday Night*, Toronto
 Saunders, Richard M., Baldwin House, University of Toronto, Toronto
 Saunders, Robert, 5 Winter St., St. Paul Minn., U.S.A.
 Saunders, S. A., 143 Spadina Road, Toronto
 Savelle, Max, Stanford University, Cal.
 Schuyler, R. L., Columbia University, New York, N.Y.
 Scott, F. R., McGill University, Montreal
 Scott, S. Morley, Dept. of External Affairs, Ottawa
 Secretary of State, Canadian Citizenship Branch, 1 Old Supreme Court Bldg., Ottawa
 Seeley, M. J., Board of Publications, University of Bishop's College, Lennoxville, P.Q.
 Setton, Kenneth M., History Dept., University of Manitoba, Winnipeg
 Shiels, Archie W., Pacific American Fisheries, South Bellingham, Wash.
 Sifton, Victor, *Winnipeg Free Press*, Winnipeg
 Simpson, Geo. W., University of Saskatchewan, Saskatoon
 Sissons, C. B., Victoria College, Toronto
 Sister John Elizabeth, Mount St. Vincent College, Halifax, N. S.
 Shantz, Glen O., 1141 View St., Victoria
 Sjostedt, Mrs. Jessie Winslow, 253 Chapel St., Ottawa
 Skilling, H. G., Dept. of Government, Dartmouth College, Hanover, N.H.
 Slater, E. H., 391 Talbot St., Market Sq., London, Ont.

(C) ANNUAL MEMBERS—*Continued*

- Smith, A. J. M., 314 Metcalfe Ave., Westmount, Montreal
 Smith, Goldwin, Dept. of History, Wayne University, Detroit 16, Mich.
 Smith, H. Greville, Canadian Industries Ltd., Box 1260, Montreal
 Smith, Joe Patterson, Illinois College, Jacksonville, Ill.
 Somerville, Mrs. J. M., Kenniston Apts., Ottawa
 Soward, F. H., University of British Columbia, Vancouver
 Spragge, G. W., 84 Gormley Ave., Toronto
 Sprague, Robert H., 28 Pine Street, Belleville
 Spry, Mrs. Graham, 83 John St., Ottawa
 Stacey, Col. C. P., Director of Historical Section, Dept. of National Defence, (Army) Ottawa
 Stanley, G. F. G., University of British Columbia, Vancouver
 Steadman, T. Park, Sandwich Collegiate Inst., Windsor, Ont.
 Steeves, Mrs. Dorothy A., 6015 Alma Road, Vancouver
 Stepler, Miss Dorothy, Strathroy, Ont.
 Stevenson, Miss Ellen, 681 Durie Street, Toronto
 Stewart, Kenneth, 529 Osborne Ave., Verdun, P.Q.
 Stovel, H. V., Canadian Industries, Box 10, Montreal
 Strang, D. M., No. 2, 1885 West 10th Ave., Vancouver
 Strange, H. G. L., c/o Searle Grain Co., Winnipeg
 Stuart, W. H., University Camp, No. 2 Rd., R.R. No. 1, Vancouver
 Sturgess, J. M., 36 Lillian Street, Toronto
 St. Veronica, Sister, Mount Saint Bernard College, Antigonish, N.S.
 Summerill, A. F., 134 Dewhurst Blvd., Toronto
 Swannell, Frank, 564 Dallas Rd., Victoria
 Sweeney, John T. J., Box 432, Charlottetown, P.E.I.
 Talman, James J., University of Western Ontario, London, Ont.
 Tanguay, Dr. Rodolphe, 19 Durham St., Sudbury, Ont.
 Taschereau, L'hon. L.-A., 187 Grande Allée, Québec
 Taylor, Malcolm G., 273 Bloor St. W., Toronto
 Taylor, R. K., Press Gallery, House of Commons, Ottawa
 Thomas, L. G., Dept. of History, University of Alberta, Edmonton
 Thomas, Lewis H., 2217 Cameron St., Regina
 Thompson, E. B., 9 Ridout St., Toronto, Ont.
 Thompson, Frederick F., 825 Kildare Rd., Windsor, Ont.
 Thomson, G. C., Barrister-at-law, Swift Current, Sask.
 Tombs, Guy, 1111 Beaver Hall Hill, Montreal
 Tombs, L. C., 503 Mount Pleasant Ave., Westmount, P.Q.
 Tomlinson, C. P., 3940 Côte des Neiges Rd., Montreal
 Topping, C. W., University of British Columbia, Vancouver, B.C.
 Tremblay, Maurice, 266 ouest, rue St-Jacques, ch. 218, Montréal
 Trotter, Reginald G., Queen's University, Kingston
 Trudel, Marcel, Laval University, Quebec
 Tucker, Gilbert Norman, 100 Redpath St., Ottawa
 Tucker, Dean H., Mount Allison University, Sackville, N.B.
 Turcot, Jules, Séminaire de Québec, Université Laval, Québec
 Turner, J. H., 567 King Street, Peterborough, Ont.
 Tweed, T. W., 40 Montclair Ave., Toronto 10
 Tyrrell, J. B., 14 Walmer Rd., Toronto
 Underhill, Frank H., Baldwin House, University of Toronto, Toronto
 Van Alstyne, Richard W., University of Southern California, University Park, Los Angeles 7, Calif., U.S.A.
 Vaughan, Mrs. O. D., 135 St. Germain Ave., Toronto
 Wade, Hugh Mason, Cornish, New Hampshire, U.S.A.
 Waines, W. J., University of Manitoba, Winnipeg
 Waldon, Miss Freda, 14 Duke Street, Hamilton, Ont.
 Wallace, Miss E., 48 Boswell Avenue, Toronto
 Walter, T. Dayman, 2442 Gladstone Ave., Windsor, Ont.
 Ward, Mrs. S. N., 706 Bathurst St., Toronto
 Warner, Donald F., Dept. of History, Macalester College, St. Paul 5, Minn.
 Watson, J. W., McMaster University, Hamilton, Ont.
 Webster, H. G., 90 Perry Street, Woodstock, Ont.
 Webster, Dr. J. C., Shediac, N.B.
 Weir, Miss M. F., Sarnia Collegiate Institute and Technical School, Sarnia, Ont.
 Weir, S. E., K.C., Bank of Commerce Bldg., Dundas and Richmond Sts., London, Ont.

(C) ANNUAL MEMBERS—*Continued*

- Westbrook, Eric C., 5527 Verdun Avenue,
Verdun, P.Q.
Whitelaw, W. M., United College, Winni-
peg
Whitton, Miss Charlotte, 236 C Rideau
Terrace, Ottawa
Williams, E. K., Huron and Erie Bldg.,
Winnipeg
Willis, John c/o International Monetary
Fund, Washington, D.C.
Wills, Harold A., c/o Northland Post,
Cochrane, Ont.
Wilson, George E., Dalhousie University,
Halifax
Winkler, H. W., Morden, Man.
Winter, Carl G., 2417-6th Ave., Sacramento
17, Calif.
Wittke, Carl F., Oberlin College, Oberlin,
Ohio
Wood, Col. Wm., 59 Grand Allée, Quebec
Woodley, E. C., 3787 Cote des Neiges,
Apt. 209, Montreal 25
Woodyatt, James B., 355 St. James St.
W., Montreal
Wright, Mrs. E. C., Box 559, Wolfville,
N.S.
Wrong, H. H., Canadian Embassy, Wash-
ington, D.C.
Younge, Miss Eva, 3600 University St.,
Montreal
Zacour, N. P., 283 Stradbrooke Avenue,
Winnipeg

(35) 5 271-4-0.F.

F5000 .C26 1948

Canadian Historical Assoc
Rapport...

RESERVE

56306

Reserve:

Canadian

56306

1948

0 1164 01013

0 1164 0194695 3

[illegible]

bd

CAT. NO. 23 233

PRINTED IN U.S.A.

